



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2020

No. 10

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 16, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

The House prepares to recess for a week of constituent visitation in home districts as the Nation anticipates the Martin Luther King long weekend.

As we remember the heroic struggle of the civil rights movement, the "badges and incidents of slavery" have perdured through policies still operative today, though recently being addressed through efforts at criminal justice reform and sentencing reform.

The pains of racism, like a national genetic defect, plague us still, though so many wish it were not so. Lord, have mercy on us.

Bless those who have been elected to secure laws protecting and expanding our cherished freedoms with the wisdom and vision to root out all traces of involuntary servitude in our Nation, most notably in human trafficking in our own time, so might we be able to declare with pride we are the land of the free.

May we, as Americans, do our part to find the image and likeness of God in those of different race or ancestral country of origin.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHABOT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests

HONORING RAYMOND LERMA

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Raymond Lerma, a beloved husband, father, and leader in the community of Corcoran, California. Ray passed away on January 11.

Among his many honored roles in life, Ray served 25 years as mayor and councilman in Corcoran, California. He was a pillar of the community.

Ray was born in El Paso, Texas, and raised in Corcoran in a large and loving family that proudly farmed the crops of the Central Valley. Encouraged by his parents to reach for higher education, Mr. Lerma graduated from UC Berkeley. He was a proud Cal Bear.

After college, Ray returned to the community that raised him to build his own family with his beloved wife, Lola. He touched countless lives in his 38 years as an educator at Corcoran High.

After retirement, he kept changing lives, teaching English as a second language to adult learners. Ray also served as a longtime board member of the King's Community Action Organization, which helps to bring resources to the Central Valley.

Ray once said he wanted to be remembered as someone who made a difference in his community. I stand before you today to say he will always be remembered for his dedication and contributions to his community. We will miss his leadership.

Ray leaves behind his wife, Lola; their three children, Eva, Ramon, and Pablo; as well as his grandchildren.

May he rest in peace.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H303

HONORING THE LIFE OF JIMMY PATRONIS, SR.

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jimmy Patronis, Sr., a local legend in Bay County, Florida, where he recently passed away at the age of 88.

Mr. Patronis truly lived a life in full, one of family, entrepreneurship, and of service to our community.

He served as a captain in the United States Air Force and then moved to Panama City in 1953 to join in the restaurant business with his brother, Johnny Patronis.

The brothers purchased Captain Anderson's, which has been in his family's ownership ever since and has become a favorite spot for people who are visiting Panama City.

From a very young age, Jimmy had an unwavering desire to serve others and make the world a better place. He had an enormous staff, and he treated all of them like family.

He leaves behind the love of his life, Helen, and four sons: Theo, Yonnie, Nick, and the current Florida chief financial officer and friend of mine, Jimmy, Jr.

Jimmy Patronis will be sorely missed by many. May he rest in peace.

HONORING DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the late, great Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

On June 23, 1963, in my hometown of Detroit, Michigan, Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered an impassioned precursor to his "I Have a Dream" speech during the historic Detroit Walk to Freedom, which recognized the 20th anniversary of the Detroit race riots.

With over 120,000 people present, the Detroit Walk to Freedom was the largest civil rights demonstration in the Nation's history. Of course, we all know that soon changed just a few weeks later with the March on Washington.

As a young Black girl growing up on the east side of Detroit, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was more than just a public figure; he was our hope. Today, I am honored to have the chance to recognize him and his work and will continue to do my part to ensure his legacy lives on.

And in today's environment, here in Washington, D.C., and this Congress, we must refocus on the ability to recognize every person based on their character, their skills and abilities, and not based on race.

RECOGNIZING BRADEN ZUKOWSKI ON HIS APPOINTMENT TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Braden Zukowski of Saxonburg, Pennsylvania. Braden is a high school senior at Knoch High School. He is the son of Brad Zukowski and Shauna Braun-Zukowski.

I am pleased to announce that Braden recently accepted a fully qualified appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Braden is a shining example of what leadership looks like. His hard work and dedication to excellence in and out of the classroom are the qualities that will make him a great midshipman. I am confident that he will continue to excel during his time at the Naval Academy.

Not only is Braden a leader in the classroom, he has also excelled in sports, serving as captain of the Knoch High School swim and cross country teams. He is also an active member of the chemistry, Spanish, history, and robotics clubs, as well as a National Honor Society member.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Braden's decision to join our Nation's Armed Forces, and I wish him the best of luck in his new venture.

FACING A TIME OF NEED FOR THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of over 3 million of our fellow Americans who are facing a time of need right now, the people of Puerto Rico.

Several of my colleagues have been working tirelessly to convey the voices of the people of Puerto Rico following the earthquakes that they have been experiencing over the past several weeks. Those voices must be more widely heard in the media and across our society because our fellow Americans are calling out for help.

The damage caused by this most recent disaster comes in addition to the devastation of Hurricane Maria and the grossly inadequate Federal response to that tragedy.

Today, the administration confirmed that it would finally end its hold on disaster aid relief that Congress authorized for Puerto Rico years ago. Now, in the wake of this most recent tragedy, the President must approve a major disaster declaration today.

Constituents across my community have reached out to me with deep concern for their friends and families, and nearly all of us represent constituents

of Puerto Rican origin. We cannot turn our backs on our fellow citizens. We must stand with them and come to their aid.

CONGRATULATING COACH PAT McLAUGHLIN

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Coach Pat McLaughlin, the head football coach at my alma mater, La Salle High School, for a significant accomplishment.

I played for La Salle back in the day, and my brother, Dave, played 10 years later.

Coach McLaughlin has been nominated for the NFL's Don Shula High School Coach of the Year award. This prestigious honor recognizes the best high school football coaches across the country for their character, integrity, leadership, dedication to the community, commitment to player protection, and on-field success.

In December, Coach McLaughlin led the La Salle Lancers to their fourth Ohio Division II football championship in the last 6 years. As this nomination affirms, he has been a leader both on and off the field.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Coach McLaughlin, as well as all the La Salle players and their families and everyone involved in the Lancer football program. They have all made, and continue to make, the entire Cincinnati community tremendously proud.

Lancers Roll Deep.

SHEDDING LIGHT ON THE SLOW IMPEACHMENT PROCESS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed some light on how slow this urgent impeachment process really unfolded.

The missile crawler-transporter used to transfer the NASA spacecraft to the launch pad travels at a rate of about 5,000 feet per hour. The slowest animal on Earth, the three-toed sloth, can travel at a speed of 792 feet per hour. The California banana slug can travel at 240 feet per hour, amazingly enough.

It is approximately 610 feet from the House desk to the Senate desk. It took 28 days for Speaker PELOSI to send the articles to the Senate at a rate of about 11 inches per hour.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats never thought this was an urgent matter of national security, as was stated. Urgent matters don't move at 11 inches per hour. Indeed, there was time to use about a dozen different souvenir pens to sign the document one letter at a time yesterday.

The dishonesty, the misdirection of House Democrats surrounding this impeachment process—well, the American public has had 28-plus days to figure this out.

Thankfully, the Senate is going to take up the USMCA today before they get balled up for the next several weeks dealing with this impeachment disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I hope they have a fair trial and treat the President correctly in this process.

CONGRATULATING SAN JACINTO COLLEGE CHANCELLOR DR. BRENDA HELLYER

(Mr. BABIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate San Jacinto College Chancellor Dr. Brenda Hellyer on receiving the prestigious Quasar Award for Economic Development Excellence from the Bay Area Houston Economic Partnership.

This award is given to an outstanding individual who has demonstrated a strong and continual effort to support the business foundations of the Greater Bay Area Houston communities.

Dr. Hellyer is highly educated, earning her master's degree in business administration and a doctorate in community college leadership from the University of Texas at Austin, where she received the Distinguished Graduate Award. She is also a certified public accountant.

In 2009, Dr. Hellyer was named chancellor of San Jacinto College and has since transformed the school with major renovations and the development of many award-winning programs.

Mr. Speaker, 1 minute is just simply not enough time to properly congratulate Dr. Hellyer, and I will submit an extension of my remarks for the RECORD.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "BORROWER DEFENSE INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY"

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 790, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 790, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 76

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in

Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability" (84 Fed. Reg. 49788 (September 23, 2019)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 76.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today for one reason: to ask that my colleagues in this House stand with me to make clear to the American people that we care more about defending students than enriching predatory schools. That is what my joint resolution, H.J. Res. 76, is all about.

In 1992 Congress added a rule known as borrower defense to the Higher Education Act to give students a legal right to seek forgiveness on their Federal student loans because of fraud by their schools.

Predatory school misconduct in the eighties was so rampant it was painfully clear to Democrats, Republicans, and everyone in between that we need protections in place for students who are scammed and cheated by their institution, and that is just as true today.

Corinthian Colleges, ITT Tech, University of Phoenix, and Dream Center—350,000 students have filed claims alleging they were defrauded by these schools. They were lied to about the job prospects they would get from these schools, they were lied to about the transferability of their credits, and they were lied to about the quality of education they would receive. The only thing they got was a useless degree and a mountain of debt after these schools abruptly closed because of rampant misconduct.

The most painful part is that these are mostly students from low-income communities, people of color, and veterans. These are Americans we should be standing up for, not taking advantage of.

In 2016 the last administration created a new borrower defense rule to streamline the process to help these students.

It sounds pretty good, right?

Not to Betsy DeVos. She then rewrote the borrower defense rule to make it almost impossible for a defrauded student to get relief on their student loans. Even in cases where schools clearly violated the law, the burden of proof on the defrauded student is so absurdly unrealistic that a student would need to hire a team of lawyers to have a shot at proving intent and misconduct from the school.

But the point made by proponents of this borrower defense rule that is most insulting is that the new rule saves taxpayer dollars. That is simply false. The new rule severely weakens the early warning system that ensures predatory schools, not taxpayers, cover the cost of debt relief. As a result in the few cases where relief is rewarded under the DeVos rule, taxpayers will be the ones to foot the bill. Beyond that, the only reason you can say that this rule actually saves money is because we are denying relief to every legitimately defrauded student.

Let me be clear: if Betty DeVos' 2019 borrower defense rule goes into effect, more students will become victims of fraud with no way to climb out of the hole that our government dug for them.

This puts my colleagues in Congress on the record. Members have a choice to make, and if they choose to vote against this resolution, then they will have to go back home and tell thousands of students, veterans, and their constituents in their district that they choose to be on the side of predatory schools over them.

I think the choice is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 76, the latest attempt by House Democrats to undermine the Trump administration. It seems these attempts will never end.

Specifically, the resolution would undo the Education Department's efforts to assist students who have been defrauded by colleges and universities while also protecting taxpayer interest.

Any school that has taken advantage of students must be held accountable. Students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm are entitled to relief and forgiveness. We can and should have bipartisan agreement on these points.

Sadly, Democrats have a long track record of pursuing radical ideological objectives at the expense of taxpayers, students, and schools. Today it is clear that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more interested in tearing down the Trump administration than providing real solutions.

Before I touch upon the advantages of the Trump administration's new rule, I would like to provide some context on the previous administration's

so-called borrower defense rule and its many shortcomings.

The Obama administration's overzealous political actions created a dangerous domino effect. In 2016, during the final months of his Presidency, President Obama implemented a borrower defense regulation that was irresponsible, drastically exceeded the scope of current practice, and came with the shocking price tag for the American taxpayer of \$42 billion.

The Obama regulations blurred the line between fraud and inadvertent mistakes made by schools. The difference between the two is critical, Mr. Speaker, because the Education Department can levy significant financial penalties on institutions found to engage in fraud which can cause a school to have to close despite no intentional wrongdoing. Most schools do not have a reckless disregard for the truth.

With this flawed rule in place, many schools could face harsh financial penalties forcing them to close leaving millions of students without access to their higher education opportunity. In fact, several historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, wrote to President Obama's Education Secretary John King, Jr., with concerns about Obama's defense rule. Their letter stated:

In fact, the proposed regulation language could undermine the financial viability of a number of academic institutions and could possibly bankrupt less financially secured colleges and universities.

In the end, the Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity and encouraged tens of thousands of borrowers, whether they were harmed or not, to apply to have their loans forgiven. This was nothing more than a political move by the left to provide a backdoor scheme to hand out free education. So it is not surprising that claim filings for loan forgiveness went from 59 in the first 20 years to roughly 300,000 claims submitted in the last 5 years.

President Trump realized quickly that placing a \$42 billion burden on the backs of taxpayers was not the answer, and his administration made it a priority to halt the Obama-era regulation from going into effect. The Trump administration worked to instill some common sense into the rulemaking process.

As a result, the administration produced a rule with clearer standards for borrower defense and increased transparency for both students and institutions.

Among other benefits, the new rule makes sure students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm receive relief; reduces the cost of the 2016 Obama-era regulation by \$11 billion because it helps students complete their education rather than indiscriminately closing schools; holds all institutions, not just for-profit colleges, accountable for misrepresentation instead of picking winners and losers at considerable cost to taxpayers; ensures due

process for all parties; extends the look-back window to qualify for closed school loan discharges from 120 to 180 days, so when schools close more students are eligible for forgiveness; and allows for arbitration which could result in borrowers' recovering resources not provided by the Education Department such as cash payments or other expenses.

The bottom line is this: the Trump administration's borrower defense rule protects student borrowers, holds all higher education institutions accountable, and saves taxpayers \$11 billion.

The American people sent us to Washington to work together and solve important issues. Our constituents would be far better served if the Democrat majority used its time to find real solutions to our Nation's issues instead of continuing to lament the 2016 election results.

Republicans stand ready to provide relief to students who have been harmed by fraud, and the borrower defense rules issued by the Trump administration are the answer.

I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do away with the political blame game so we can move forward and work in a bipartisan manner to address issues facing America.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 76, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when a college makes promises to recruit students, we expect those promises to be met. Yet time after time we see colleges closing or losing accreditation, leaving their students with worthless degrees.

There are currently 240,000 defrauded students waiting for loan relief, and more than 40,000 of these students are from my home State of California. These defrauded student borrowers have been needlessly waiting—many for over a year—to obtain this student loan relief.

The most inexcusable part of this situation is that the Department of Education, during all this time, could have brought relief to these students using the original borrower defense rule.

Instead, this administration has decided to create an entirely worthless rule that, firstly, does almost nothing to help borrowers. Further, it provides clear preference to the very sham colleges that are compromising the integrity and the purpose of the original borrower defense rule.

This recent rule is sending a message to the American public that any scammer can open up a school, collect money, defraud our students, and dodge any consequences.

It is outrageous to learn about the hundreds of servicemen and -women who have tried to improve their professional standings by enrolling in one of these programs only to end up with a

pointless credential and a lot of unconscionable debt. In these tragic cases, many have not only expended their GI Bill funding for good but have also lost years of their lives working hard and studying to gain these futile degrees.

The original borrower defense rule was an honest attempt to address these grievances and give students their dignity back. Rather, we have here today a new rule that makes it nearly impossible for students to truly regain what has been lost due to this large-scale con job.

Mr. Speaker, why are we making it harder for our defrauded students to recover their lives?

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is the first step toward blocking these flawed and misguided changes to the borrower defense rule from taking effect, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

□ 0930

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 76, certainly not because I want to defraud students, certainly not because I want to protect scam education institutions—not at all.

The Department of Education released an updated and improved borrower defense rule last year for all the opposite reasons, to, in fact, protect students and protect quality education and promote that but also to protect the taxpayer. It did all of the above.

I think we need to keep that in mind and not just spend our time on messaging. We want to have results that produce quality education opportunities for the future.

The 2016 Obama administration rule was a broad, sweeping, reactionary measure, sadly, to an issue that requires a more nuanced solution that will have results.

Defrauded students who have been financially harmed deserve relief, absolutely. The Department's 2019 rule establishes a fair process in which these students will get the relief they deserve.

A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I hearken back to the hearing we had with Secretary DeVos. I was embarrassed for the first time, really, in the many years I have been on this committee to hear someone who has spent her adult life promoting education maligned in that way. I would challenge any of our committee members, myself included, to exhibit the number of years, talent, and treasure put toward enhancing opportunities for schools and education, and, by the way, the students and success that we have seen. I think that the success that the President saw in this Secretary of Education was why she was put there.

This rule that is in place right now, which we are debating today to try to

change, is a rule that will enhance education as well as protect the taxpayers.

When Secretary DeVos was before our committee last month, she explained how the Department is also taking proactive measures to prevent fraud from occurring through more transparency for students on the College Scorecard.

Under the 2019 rule, predatory schools were held accountable for misrepresentations leading to financial harm to students. This rule also lays out a transparent framework that guarantees the process while establishing a proportional connection between financial harm and the amount awarded.

Hard-earned taxpayer dollars should be used responsibly. I think we will all agree to that. This 2019 rule respects the taxpayer while also allowing appropriate relief for defrauded students and setting an example for institutions that we will not accept what has gone on.

Mr. Speaker, I end by saying this: I urge my colleagues to vote “no” today to keep a responsible system that protects defrauded students.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this joint resolution, and I congratulate the gentlewoman from Nevada for her leadership on this issue.

Secretary DeVos and this administration have proven that they will go to the ends of the Earth to defend predatory for-profit colleges at the expense of our students and taxpayers.

This holds true for the DeVos borrower defense rule, which creates unnecessary obstacles for students seeking debt relief from predatory for-profit colleges. It even punishes students with approved claims by allowing these colleges to deny students their transcripts and refuse to verify their earned credits.

Passing this joint resolution is a crucial step, and I urge my colleagues to support it. But we also must build on this work by bringing our Higher Education Act reauthorization to the floor. Next up, we have to pass the College Affordability Act with even stronger protections for American students.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add a personal note. From 2007 to 2011, I ran the workforce system of the State of Michigan. In those years, fraudulent, for-profit higher education programs emerged as a major problem in Michigan and in our Nation. As a former State program director, I can tell you that our States do not have the resources or the authority to remedy this problem. The Federal Government must act.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Johnny Taylor at the

Society for Human Resource Management, SHRM.

SOCIETY FOR HUMAN RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT,

Alexandria, VA, January 15, 2020.

Hon. SUSAN DAVIS,
Chairman, U.S. House Education Subcommittee
on Higher Education and Workforce Invest-
ment, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD SMUCKER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education Sub-
committee on Higher Education and Work-
force Investment, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER SMUCKER: Every new rule comes with the risk of unintended negative impact even when the best of intentions exists on both sides. This is particularly prevalent in higher education—a space I know well following seven years as the President and CEO of the Thurgood Marshall College Fund and having served as a Trustee for the University of Miami, Drake University and the Cooper Union. It is with this lens and my current lens as President and CEO of the Society for Human Resource Management, Chair of the President’s Board of Advisors on HBCUs, and member of the White House American Workforce Policy Advisory Board that I feel compelled to provide perspective on the U.S. Department of Education’s updated rule governing borrower defense to repayment.

It’s important to take a step back. Three and a half years ago, the Department unveiled proposed revisions to the borrower defense to repayment rule. During the comment period many constituencies, including the HBCU community, asserted that certain elements of the revisions had the potential to be “injurious and burdensome” and could cause many schools financial harm. These concerns referred mainly to the standard by which institutions would be judged to have misrepresented the conditions of a borrower’s loan, broadening of the definition of “misrepresentation,” and the basis for potential administrative action by the Secretary—including fines or termination from participation in Title IV programs under the Higher Education Act (HEA).

One of Secretary DeVos’s first actions was to postpone the effective date for the proposed borrower defense rules. She then reconvened the negotiated rulemaking committees to address, among other things, the concerns raised by HBCUs and other Minority Serving Institutions that primarily serve first-generation, low-income students. The Secretary encouraged all parties to take a step back and find a solution that would be fairer to students and schools and relieve taxpayers of significant costs.

A year later, having not reached consensus about the best way forward, the Department of Education published its own revised rules clarifying who is eligible for relief, the maximum amount of said relief, and how long a borrower can bring a claim. More importantly, the Department made a commitment to consumer education for students and their families prior to them enrolling in college instead of having them litigate poor college choice decisions after-the-fact when they’ve poured significant amounts of time and money into earning a degree without any reasonable hope of achieving a fair return on their investment. I’m of the opinion that the Department’s new borrower defense rules protect individual borrowers from fraud, ensures accountability across institutions of higher education, and protects taxpayers.

While the resulting new rules are not perfect, they go a long way toward addressing the challenges of students and colleges. The HBCU Community had major concerns about the initial 2016 revisions because they placed all of the accountability on the schools and

had a low threshold for punitive action. In addition, many college leaders disagreed with the “triggers” for administrative action. The new rules provide flexibility for schools to make changes to their course offerings and graduation requirements based on costs, student interest and employer needs without being characterized as fraudulent. Now that nearly all of the major concerns raised by the HBCU Community were addressed by the Secretary, it is time to pass the rules so we can put our collective energy into educating America’s diverse future workforce.

America has a talent shortage—one that will only get worse in the foreseeable future due to our low birth rate. Adding insult to injury, we have a workforce in critical need of re-skilling with a very large percentage of Americans sitting on the sidelines as a result and not participating in the labor force. As borrowers and schools move forward, both groups should be laser-focused on addressing this issue and improving the employability of the U.S. workforce.

On the front end, borrowers should select schools and programs that lead to good jobs and whose costs are commensurate with salaries for their industry of choice. Then colleges, having enrolled the right students in the right programs, must proactively develop relationships with employers to co-design relevant curricula that meet our country’s need for skilled workers.

All parties must put aside petty partisan differences to arm our country with a highly-skilled future U.S. workforce sans unnecessarily burdensome student loan debt. Supporting the new borrower defense rules proposed by the Department of Education is an important first step.

Sincerely,

JOHNNY C. TAYLOR, Jr.,
President & CEO.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some quotes from the letter.

“This is particularly prevalent in higher education—a space I know well following 7 years as the president and CEO of the Thurgood Marshall College Fund and having served as trustee for the University of Miami, Drake University, and the Cooper Union. It is with this lens and my current lens as president and CEO of the Society for Human Resource Management, Chair of the President’s Board of Advisors on HBCUs, and member of the White House American Workforce Policy Advisory Board that I feel compelled to provide perspective on the U.S. Department of Education’s updated rule governing borrower defense to repayment. . . .

“I am of the opinion that the Department’s new borrower defense rules protect individual borrowers from fraud, ensures accountability across institutions of higher education, and protects taxpayers. . . .

“The new rules provide flexibility for schools to make changes to their course offerings and graduation requirements based on costs, student interest, and employer needs without being characterized as fraudulent. Now that nearly all of the major concerns raised by the HBCU community were addressed by the Secretary, it is time to pass the rules so we can put our collective energy into educating America’s diverse future workforce. . . .

"All parties must put aside petty partisan differences to arm our country with a highly skilled future U.S. workforce sans unnecessarily burdensome student loan debt. Supporting the new borrower defense rules proposed by the Department of Education is an important first step."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of this resolution and thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution conveys the congressional disapproval of the Department of Education's refusal to protect students and taxpayers from predatory institutions. Those students are victims of widespread, proven fraud about graduation rates, job placement rates, and transferability of credits.

Fortunately, the law provides relief, but instead of maintaining the Obama-era borrower defense rule, which provides a fair and streamlined process to provide debt relief to defrauded students, the Department of Education has finalized a new borrower defense rule that prevents an overwhelming majority of defrauded students from getting relief.

We should reject this new rule and provide meaningful relief to defrauded students. Making defrauded students whole is the right thing to do, but it is not the only thing we should do.

We must ensure that students and taxpayers are not defrauded in the first place. That is why we should pass the College Affordability Act, a comprehensive overhaul of our higher education system that cracks down on low-quality, predatory schools. The College Affordability Act holds schools accountable for students' success and cuts the cost of college for students and families across the country.

Mr. Speaker, to address the present problem, those students need relief today. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of congressional disapproval.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. All institutions, regardless of their tax status, must be held accountable for fraudulent behavior, and that is exactly what the 2019 borrower defense regulation accomplishes.

I am very interested in the way our colleagues are using the term and the way the Obama administration categorizes the schools we call for-profits. They are called predatory. Why is that?

It is very interesting to me that I have always thought that what makes this country great is our capitalistic system, yet our colleagues think that anybody that makes a profit is predatory. That is so counter to the American theme, the American way of life,

but that is what they call them, predatory. It is really, really unfair to do that.

Republicans care about all students, all institutions, and all taxpayers. It is a shame my friends across the aisle feel otherwise.

Back in 2016, the previous administration let "selective, regionally accredited liberal arts schools" off the hook from facing consequences for inflating data in marketing materials.

Students who filed a borrower defense claim in this situation would be denied relief. Why? Because President Obama's administration believed this theoretical school and the education the student subsequently received is somehow superior to other institutions. Justice was not served in this example.

Before my colleagues argue that this example is theoretical and rarely happens, let me list a few examples, without naming names.

A public flagship university gave U.S. News incorrect information about alumni contributions from 1999 to 2019.

Last year, five schools were unranked from U.S. News & World Report after all five of those schools—two public and three private not-for-profits—acknowledged they provided incorrect information.

In 2018, a public university admitted, over the course of several years, that it intentionally—intentionally—submitted false data to boost the rankings of its online MBA program.

Other examples in the past decade include prominent institutions fudging acceptance rates, SAT scores, high school GPAs, and graduation rates.

The Trump administration recognizes the borrower defense to repayment process must be fair to students, taxpayers, and institutions. I am glad they struck a balance that gives due process to all parties involved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 76, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Nevada has 21 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, before I yield, I would like to clarify for the record that this example that was just included by Ms. FOXX was an example that was included in the rule in 2016, and in fact, there were no claims filed under that example.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

□ 0945

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 76, which will reverse the Trump administration's harmful new borrower defense rule.

The initial borrower defense rule was designed to provide defrauded students with the debt relief they are entitled to

receive under the Higher Education Act. Unfortunately, Secretary DeVos rewrote the rule to make it nearly impossible for future students who are victimized by deceptive institutions to get the relief they need and deserve.

According to the Department's own estimate, only about 3 percent of the loan debt held by defrauded borrowers would be dismissed under the new rule. That is not justice for victims of fraud.

We must also continue our work to update the Higher Education Act to prevent unscrupulous institutions from harming students and taxpayers in the first place. The College Affordability Act will hold institutions accountable and make college more affordable and equitable for everyone.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 76 today and the College Affordability Act when it comes to the floor.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, but I think what we all support and what we all agree on is that individuals who are harmed by fraudulent practices should have their debts forgiven.

And let's just look at where we are. This is 20 years this has been on the books. For 20 years, 60 cases were filed—60. I will emphasize that. Since 2015, at the end of the previous administration, 287,000 cases have been filed.

So we all want to know if there is fraud. We don't want fraud. We don't want people harmed by fraud, individuals harmed by fraud to have to pay that back. And remember, the money is going to our hardworking taxpayers.

So that is all this rules says. It says that there is fraud; you are harmed by fraud; and you don't have to pay it back as an individual.

Let's just look at an example of that.

What if the fraud of a school is they advertise a work placement rate of 85 percent and it is only 50 percent. Well, that is fraud. But if you were one of the 50 percent who got a job, were you harmed? You got your education; you got a job; you moved forward. Should the taxpayers forgive your student loans when you got the education and got the job that you were moving for?

That is all. We are trying to make it reasonable. The 287,000 cases that are sitting before Secretary DeVos would be under the old rule. This is the new rule going forward, so people will know what it is and understand that, one, we are fighting fraud. If you were harmed by fraud and you can prove that as an individual, you still get your loans forgiven.

I think it is reasonable. I think that it sets a process in place that people can understand. It has it going forward. I support the rule, and I oppose this resolution.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Under Secretary Betsy DeVos, the Department of Education has abandoned its responsibility to put students first and hold predatory, for-profit colleges accountable. The Department has rolled back protections for students seeking a foothold in the middle class through higher education.

In what amounts to a giveaway to predatory, for-profit colleges, Secretary DeVos has dismantled a crucial protection for students who were defrauded by shady institutions that saddled them with student loan debt, provided them with subpar education, and issued them useless degrees.

Borrower defense to repayment was intended to provide full student loan debt forgiveness to defrauded students. But Secretary DeVos has issued a new rule which makes it harder for students to prove that they were defrauded and fails to provide students with the full student loan debt relief that they are legally entitled to.

Now, to make this even worse, she eliminated protections for students whose schools shut down, shut down before they completed their programs, leaving them burdened with loans and often without the ability to transfer their credits elsewhere.

240,000 students—nearly 42,000 students from California—are waiting for relief, suffering emotional and financial hardships in the process. Many of these students attended the now-defunct Corinthian Colleges, an institution that even my Republican colleagues have agreed was in the business of defrauding students.

These students did everything right, but they were deceived by a slew of false promises from for-profit institutions that only saw them as a boost to their bottom line.

Secretary DeVos is using the power of her office to defend a shady industry. Today, we are here to send a clear message: We Democrats stand with America's students who should be relieved of student debt unjustly accrued.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 76.

We all want to make sure that America's students get the education they deserve in the college they pay for that education or the higher education institution. By advancing this legislation today, the majority of this Chamber seeks to turn back the clock on borrower defense, leading to dangerous consequences for students, those repaying their loans, and the American taxpayer.

The Obama-era rule, which the majority seeks to return us to, was marked by regulatory chaos, excessive punishments, and ridiculous costs. The Obama rule had no clarity and sought to forgive student loans on a massive scale, regardless of the cost to the taxpayers.

Estimates put the total cost of the loan forgiveness giveaway at \$40 bil-

lion. It also excessively punished schools with harsh penalties, sometimes leading to their closure, ending access to another avenue for higher education for some current and prospective students. That is why the 2019 Trump administration issued the new Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability rule.

The new rule currently in effect provides:

Regulatory clarity for all institutions;

Affords due process to both students and institutions;

Narrowly tailors relief to actual harm;

Holds all institutions accountable for misrepresentation;

Provides students with more options to continue their education should their school close; and

Allows for faster relief by allowing institution-level arbitration.

Importantly, the 2019 rule is estimated to save taxpayers \$11 billion from the 2016 Obama rule.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot afford to return to the outdated, costly, and confusing Obama-era rule the majority seeks to return to effect today.

I urge a 'no' vote on the joint resolution.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to, first, clarify the record that the 60 students who filed claims in the past 20 years is because students didn't understand they had the right to file those claims.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for her fierce leadership on this.

I rise in strong support of this resolution to block Betsy DeVos' callous attempt to rewrite the borrower defense repayment rule. That original rule protected student borrowers who have been cheated by predatory, for-profit colleges.

This rule change would make it nearly impossible for defrauded students to have their loans forgiven, and it strips away justice for 240,000 borrowers whose claims the Trump administration has refused to process. That includes my own constituents, whom I had a roundtable with, and they have filed claims after their school, the for-profit Art Institute of Seattle, abruptly closed last year.

Some of those students have rightly applied for loan forgiveness through the borrower defense to repayment process because they are ineligible for closed school discharge, and now they face extreme barriers to the relief that they deserve because Secretary DeVos has put profits before the students she took an oath to serve.

One of those students said: I am left with no degree, extra thousands of dollars in private loans that they pressured me to get. I feel tricked, guilty, and screwed.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this resolution that will defend students, and I call on the House to also pass the College Affordability Act, which will crack down on predatory for-profit colleges in a comprehensive manner.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure the American people understand the truth, and it is especially important when we are on the floor of the House.

What has been happening here this morning is that apples and oranges are being compared, and it is very important that that not happen here because that can mislead the public.

I think most of us learned this in school. When laws are passed and rules are passed, they go forward, not backward, Mr. Speaker. The new rules go forward. They apply in the future. They don't go backward. They don't affect the people who were in school in some of these schools that closed before.

Those students, unfortunately for those students, are under the previous rule, the Obama rule, and that is how they are being handled. That is the major problem here.

Our colleagues are saying many of these people didn't know what the rules were. That is not the fault of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. It is up to the students to understand the rules.

And, yes, many of them are having difficult times because the rule is so bad. That is exactly what the new rule is trying to fix. It is trying to bring clarity and help these students understand when they will be able to apply.

But the students who were at Corinthian and ITT are being handled under the Obama-era rule, and that is exactly why they are having problems. We have been pointing that out over and over and over again, yet our colleagues refuse to acknowledge that that is the nub of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76, which was introduced by my good friend and colleague from Nevada, SUSIE LEE, and of which I am a proud cosponsor.

Students defrauded by predatory for-profit colleges can be left with crushing debt, useless degrees, and none of the job opportunities they were promised.

When Secretary DeVos has testified before the Education and Labor Committee over the past year, on two separate occasions she has claimed that students are her number one priority, as they should be. Yet, as Secretary, she has acted at all times as though students are the enemy and as though

a quality and affordable education is her last priority.

Secretary DeVos has the ability to provide immediate relief to students who were defrauded. Instead, she has halted loan relief for borrowers and changed the rules to deprive them of relief. Under the new rule from Secretary DeVos, defrauded borrowers can be denied debt relief, even in cases where predatory schools clearly violated the law.

More than 7,000 Pennsylvanians are suffering while their applications for financial relief are sitting in limbo at the Department of Education. We must protect students and taxpayers by passing this resolution, which blocks the DeVos rule from going into effect.

Students are my number one priority. Unfortunately, I don't believe that the Secretary can say the same.

I am proud to stand up for students and to be an original cosponsor of this resolution. I am also proud that the Education and Labor Committee recently passed the College Affordability Act out of committee, which would provide more protections for students and taxpayers.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when I have had the privilege of being in that chair, I have often been reminded to ask Members to refrain from making comments about the President or Members of the Cabinet. I am not hearing that being said this morning, and I would just like to call it to the Speaker's attention.

I would also like to say that as long as people are getting up on the floor and misrepresenting what is happening in this administration, I will continue to remind them that the rule that is being enforced is the Obama-era rule, and any students who are being harmed are being harmed as a result of that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Secretary DeVos' new borrower defense rule drastically changes the existing 2016 rule making it harder for students to get the relief that they deserve. Only 3 percent of students are projected to even benefit from this new provision.

Students should be focused on getting the quality education they were promised, not worrying about being saddled with large debts from schools that could not and did not deliver on that education promise.

The Secretary's rule takes the burden of repayment away from the fraudulent institutions and places it on the back of the taxpayer. Americans should not be responsible for the dishonest actions of a predatory school.

I thank Congresswoman LEE for introducing H.J. Res. 76, an important

step in protecting our students and holding fraudulent institutions accountable.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The taxpayers ought not pay the tab for a student who files a claim that says I didn't like the president of this school; therefore, my loan should be forgiven. Those are the claims being filed by some of the students.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the implementation of the harmful DeVos/Trump borrower defense regulation.

Instead of working on behalf of students, Secretary DeVos is enriching predatory for-profit colleges that leave students with crushing debt. Instead of creating a streamlined process to help defrauded borrowers access relief and move forward with their lives, this administration has given dishonest schools new tools they can use to keep taking advantage of students.

In my district in 2016, the courts found that the Minnesota School of Business and Globe University engaged in consumer fraud and purposely deceived more than 1,000 Minnesota students who were systematically misled to believe that they would obtain a degree and credits that were essentially meaningless, losing not only \$33.8 million, but also their time and countless opportunities.

It is the government's duty to look out for those victimized students and to make sure they don't continue to suffer at the hands of the greedy institutions that took advantage of them.

Secretary DeVos should be ashamed of herself for failing to uphold that duty and for once again putting profit over people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the 2016 borrower defense regulation does a great disservice to our Nation's students and institutions of post-secondary education because the previous administration did not design the borrower defense rule to improve post-secondary education.

Let me explain. The Higher Education Act establishes that a borrower can receive loan forgiveness if he or she attends an institution that engages in an act or omission which led the individual to borrow a loan. An example of an act or omission could be an institution lying about its graduation rates in order to lure more students to enroll in that program. That seems fair.

It is important to note that in the 2019 rule, students who suffer financial harm from fraudulent institutions are eligible and will receive loan relief. But where the Obama administration went

haywire was when they blurred the distinction between what acts or omissions constitute fraud versus an inadvertent mistake.

Many institutions, including HBCUs and public flagship universities, were concerned that a single marketing error could set off a domino effect of borrowers seeking and receiving forgiveness.

For example, in a New York Times article published in 2018, Henry N. Tisdale, the President of the small campus of Claflin University in Orangeburg, South Carolina, expressed concern over the Obama-era regulation. Mr. Tisdale said, "A small mistake or error at a college like Claflin could put us out of business. We don't have the resources ready to respond to frivolous claims."

Claflin University is just one of the many small, nonprofit institutions that serve low-income, minority, and first-generation students that have become at risk due to the Obama-era rules. Institutions like these would be on the hook for debt and could close due to financial pressures. This would deny students their education, act as an economic drain on the community benefiting from the institution's business, and harm taxpayers who may ultimately be responsible to pay off the loans.

It is reasonable to conclude that the Obama administration's borrower defense rule could be the deciding factor in colleges prematurely closing. In fact, the Obama administration estimated it would have the effect of closing many institutions, which is why their rule is projected to cost over \$40 billion in 10 years. Luckily, the Trump administration acted quickly to correct the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to clarify that the comments that were just quoted were on the proposed rule, and those issues were fixed.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE).

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in support of hundreds of thousands of students across the Nation who are victims of predatory for-profit colleges. Over 4,000 borrowers in Maryland and 227,000 nationally are paying the price because the department, led by Betsy DeVos, appears to have intentionally decided not to process the claims.

Before coming to Congress, I led a business of over 7,000 employees. At the end of the day, the buck stopped with me to make sure we had the staff that we needed to serve our customers. Not only did Secretary DeVos not have the staff she needed to follow the law, but through the new rule, this administration is proposing she is making it harder for students to get the relief they deserve.

This is not how we should treat America's students who are looking to make a better future for themselves. I urge my colleagues to stand with the students and reverse this Trump administration rule.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 76.

I do agree with my colleagues across the aisle that as Members of Congress it is our job to ensure accountability over how taxpayer dollars are spent, and that is a very important aspect of our job here. And when tax dollars flow to an institution of higher education that has not lived up to its promises made to students, then defrauded individuals do deserve a transparent process to seek relief and have their student loans discharged.

Under Secretary DeVos' leadership, the U.S. Department of Education's new borrower defense rule replaces a flawed process with one that is fair for taxpayers and is fair for students. The new rule establishes a defined standard for borrower defense to repayment, clearing up years of confusion that has left students in financial hardship and schools exposed to increased risk of closure despite no intentional misrepresentation.

The Trump administration's rule also strengthens opportunities for relief for students who were misled by a school by expanding the window of time that students have to discharge their loans. But most importantly, this process, which was developed over many months and with stakeholder engagement through every step of the way, strengthened accountability on all institutions of higher education by ensuring that each and every school is held to the same standard, not just the taxpaying for-profit institutions.

Despite all of these commonsense measures, today's CRA seeks to move us backwards simply to undermine the Trump administration while preventing students from making educational choices that best meet their needs.

H.J. Res. 76 will repeal the Trump administration's rule to reinstate the flawed, confusing standards that were implemented in 2016. That rule, the Obama-era borrower defense rule, ignored due process, lowered the standard of proof, and left taxpayers on the hook for forgiving student loans to the tune of \$42 billion regardless of an individual claim's merit.

The Trump administration's thorough methodology for borrower defense claims ensures any and every student will have a pathway to have their student loans discharged if they have been defrauded while protecting taxpayer dollars from massive loan forgiveness schemes. In fact, this new rule is estimated to save taxpayers \$11 billion.

It is critical that we leave this rule in place to protect students and tax-

payers alike. I urge my colleagues to place commonsense policy above politics and oppose this misguided CRA that ultimately will harm all Americans.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Nevada has 11½ minutes. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2 minutes.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Today I rise to offer my strong support for the joint resolution led by my friend and colleague, Congresswoman SUSIE LEE.

On the Education and Labor Committee we are taking action on behalf of students who were fleeced by predatory for-profit colleges.

Secretary DeVos has ignored hundreds of thousands of pending claims from defrauded borrowers and taxpayers. That includes almost 3,000 from my home State of Massachusetts. Despite having authority to provide full and immediate relief, the Secretary's borrower defense rule does not make students whole.

Her new, partial-relief formula to determine debt forgiveness adds further insult to injury. We tested that formula in committee with the secretary and exposed how flawed it is, how it severely restricts the relief one can receive.

H.J. Res. 76 is necessary to block efforts to weaken key consumer protections against crushing student debt and useless degrees.

I thank Congresswoman LEE and the committee for taking legislative action, and I call upon my colleagues to support defrauded students in this joint resolution.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I thank Representatives BOBBY SCOTT and SUSIE LEE for their leadership on this important resolution. I rise to support H.J. Res. 76 which blocks Secretary DeVos' attempts to undermine the much-needed borrower defense rule.

□ 1015

The original rule was implemented in 2016 to cancel the debt of those students defrauded by their colleges. The Secretary's replacement rule is shameful. It would cancel only 3 percent of the student loans that result from school misconduct.

While totally unacceptable, the Secretary's actions are nothing new. The for-profit college industry has been exploiting students for decades, and I have been fighting them back for just as long.

As an assemblywoman in California, I authored one of the Nation's first

laws regulating for-profit schools. As a Congresswoman, I passed the 85/15 rule, which limited the amount of Federal funding for-profit colleges receive from taxpayers.

In 2015, when the for-profit Corinthian Colleges closed down after years of fraud and misconduct, I was one of the Members of Congress to endorse and support the Corinthian 100, a group of former students who refused to pay back loans accrued while attending Corinthian.

This Congress, I continue fighting for students. Last year, the House Financial Services Committee held two hearings examining the student loan crisis. Last month, the committee approved three bills that will provide strong student borrower protections, including for those harmed by for-profit colleges.

Congress should not stand idly by while Secretary DeVos tries to make it easier for students to get defrauded by for-profit schools.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, Michele Kernizan is an Air Force veteran and a constituent of mine. After serving our country, she enrolled at Kaplan University.

Kaplan misled Michele about her GI Bill benefits and persuaded her to take out loans to cover tuition. They offered a so-called stipend for books and supplies, but it wasn't a stipend. It was additional student loans.

By the time Michele learned the truth, she had \$42,654 in student debt and no degree.

The 2016 borrower defense to repayment rule created a process to help defrauded borrowers like Michele access student debt relief. Secretary DeVos' rewrite guts protections for students and taxpayers in favor of shielding bad-acting institutions from accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's CRA so veterans like Michele have a fair process.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 76 and in strong opposition to the Department of Education's change to the borrower defense rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand in defense of defrauded students nationwide from getting relief that they are entitled to. This significant step ensures that we hold the institutions accountable for their actions by blocking this rule from going into effect.

Allowing this rule to move forward is a dismantling of student protections

and would further exacerbate the student loan crisis in our country, which is a major crisis for our young people.

We should not be protecting fraudulent institutions that prey on students. We should be working to prevent fraud in education in the first place.

It is vital that defrauded students have a process that is fair and easy to understand, and this new guidance makes it substantially more difficult for these students to receive the relief that they desperately need. Denying debt relief to defrauded students is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to support this bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LEE for yielding and for her leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation, which reverses actions by Betsy DeVos that would deny debt relief to students defrauded by predatory colleges.

Over recent years, we have seen for-profit colleges like Corinthian and ITT Tech collapse, leaving students in my district and across the country with crushing debt and none of the job opportunities that they were promised.

These students were defrauded, plain and simple, and they have been left holding the bag, thanks to Betsy DeVos' refusal to implement an Obama-era rule that provides defrauded students with relief and helps them move forward with their lives.

Instead, DeVos rewrote the rule to make it harder for borrowers to get relief, severely restricted how much relief they can receive, and shifted the costs of providing debt relief from predatory schools to the taxpayers.

DeVos is putting the interests of predatory for-profit schools above students, and it is wrong. We should always put students first, and many of them are waiting on Betsy DeVos to do the right thing.

As of last month, 240,000 defrauded students, including more than 41,000 students in California, are still waiting for DeVos to take action on their claims for debt relief. Many of these students can't afford to enroll in another school without the debt relief they are owed. They can't move on with their lives because Betsy DeVos is dragging her feet. That is simply not fair.

We must pass this legislation to stop DeVos from making it even harder for defrauded students to get the relief they desperately need.

Ultimately, we must do much more to help stop schools from defrauding students and taxpayers in the first place.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this action to overturn Secretary DeVos' misguided policy against defrauded students.

Predatory, for-profit colleges are scamming students and taxpayers out of millions of dollars. Secretary DeVos is helping them to get away with it.

I held an oversight hearing in my Committee on Appropriations subcommittee, and what did we find? While accounting for only 9 percent of all students enrolled in post-secondary education, predatory, for-profit colleges account for 34 percent of all defaults.

Under Secretary DeVos' new rule, students may not receive the financial relief that they deserve and are entitled to under the borrower defense to repayment provision of the Higher Education Act.

While the Obama administration created a streamlined process to help students access the relief, the Trump administration is making it nearly impossible.

Under the Secretary's new rule, if borrowers cannot prove the school intentionally defrauded them or if they cannot file their claim fast enough or if they cannot document their exact financial harm, they lose out. As little as 3 percent of eligible debt will be forgiven now.

With the Secretary's rule, what little relief there is will likely be shouldered by taxpayers, not the schools that are committing the fraud. It is wrong.

In Connecticut, 1,100 defrauded students are waiting to be made whole. They need help, not Secretary DeVos' cruel policy.

We must pass this Congressional Review Act resolution and stop her.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Nevada has 3 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and would inquire through the Chair if my colleague has any remaining speakers on her side.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have no further people to testify. We are ready to close.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again, the Secretary has been faithfully executing the law. The problem is that our colleagues don't like the law as it is, and so we need to change the law if they don't like what the Secretary is exe-

cuting. However, that is not where we are today.

Students who have been harmed by fraudulent practices deserve relief, period. There is no disagreement on that issue, Mr. Speaker.

Sadly, President Obama's overzealous and flawed borrower defense regulation abandoned due process and limited student choice. So the Trump administration acted quickly to reverse this struggling regulation.

In 2019, the Education Department issued a new borrower defense rule to better protect borrowers and taxpayers. The rule is the result of more than 2 years of deliberations, public hearings, negotiations with the higher education stakeholders, and considering, incorporating, and responding to public comments on the issues.

To hear our colleagues speak about it, it is something that came straight off of Secretary DeVos' desk. Not true.

Thanks to this regulatory reset, all colleges and universities will be held accountable, defrauded students will see relief, and taxpayer dollars will be better protected.

Today's resolution would repeal the Trump administration's rule and go back to Obama regulations that harm students and taxpayers. That is unreasonable to think about, that our colleagues want to do that. They want to actually harm the students they claim they want to help. Students deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this misguided resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to correct some misinformation about the 2016 rule that my colleagues on the other side have stated today.

First of all, the law, the Higher Education Act, entitles borrowers a right to relief. This applies to all institutions, not just a few.

The reason the 2019 rule saves money is because meritorious claims will be denied. Under this new rule, students will see only 3 percent of their loans discharged, and predatory institutions will pay only 1 percent of their fraud.

The 2019 rule sets an impossibly high bar for students to prove relief, inconsistent with State law.

The 2016 rule allowed for arbitration. It just banned predispute arbitration and class action waivers.

The 2016 rule was closely negotiated with institutions, including HBCUs, that struck a balance that was fair to institutions and students.

The Department of Education predicts that by 2021 over 200,000 borrowers will face this type of fraud. This is not about borrowers in the past; this is about borrowers moving forward. This number will only continue to grow if we don't pass the reforms in the College Affordability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD three letters: a letter from The American Legion; a letter from 20 State attorneys general; and a letter from a coalition of groups, including Student Veterans of America, supporting our effort to overturn the Secretary's harmful borrower defense rule.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COMMANDER,
Washington, DC, December 18, 2019.
Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: On behalf of the nearly 2 million members of The American Legion, I write to express our support for Joint Resolution 56, providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to, "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability." The rule, as currently written, is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers or student loans, depriving them of the opportunity for debt relief that Congress intended to afford them under the Higher Education Act. Affirming this position is American Legion Resolution No. 82: Preserve Veteran and Servicemember Rights to Gainful Employment and Borrower Defense Protections, adopted in our National Convention 2017.

Thousands of student veterans have been defrauded over the years—promised their credits would transfer when they wouldn't, given false or misleading job placement rates in marketing, promised one educational experience when they were recruited, but given something completely different. This type of deception against our veterans and servicemembers has been a lucrative scam for unscrupulous actors.

As veterans are aggressively targeted due to their service to our country, they must be afforded the right to group relief. The Department of Education's "Borrower Defense" rule eliminates this right, forcing veterans to individually prove their claim, share the specific type of financial harm they suffered, and prove the school knowingly made substantial misrepresentations. The preponderance of evidence required for this process is so onerous that the Department of Education itself estimated that only 3 percent of applicants would get relief.

Until every veteran's application for student loan forgiveness has been processed, we will continue to demand fair and timely decisions. The rule that the Department of Education has promulgated flagrantly denies defrauded veterans these dignities, and The American Legion calls on Congress to overturn this regulatory action.

Senator Durbin, The American Legion applauds your leadership in addressing this critical issue facing our nation's veterans and their families.

For God & Country,
JAMES W. "BILL" OXFORD,
National Commander.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Boston, Massachusetts, January 14, 2020.

Senator DICK DURBIN,
Washington, DC.
Representative SUSIE LEE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN AND REPRESENTATIVE LEE: We, the undersigned Attorneys General of Massachusetts, California, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawai'i, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington write to

express our support for the resolution of disapproval that you have introduced regarding the U.S. Department of Education's ("Department") 2019 Borrower Defense Rule ("2019 Rule") pursuant to the Congressional Review Act. In issuing the 2019 Rule, the Department has abdicated its Congressionally-mandated responsibility to protect students and taxpayers from the misconduct of unscrupulous schools. The rule provides no realistic prospect for borrowers to discharge their loans when they have been defrauded by predatory for-profit schools, and it eliminates financial responsibility requirements for those same institutions. If this rule goes into effect, the result will be disastrous for students while providing a windfall to abusive schools.

The 2019 Rule squanders and reverses recent progress the Department has made in protecting students from fraud and abuse. Three years ago, the Department completed a thorough rulemaking process addressing borrower defense and financial responsibility, in which the views of numerous schools, stakeholders, and public commenters were considered and incorporated into a comprehensive set of regulations. The regulations, promulgated by the Department in November 2016 ("2016 Rule"), made substantial progress toward achieving the Department's then-stated goal of providing defrauded borrowers with a consistent, clear, fair, and transparent process to seek debt relief. At the same time, the 2016 Rule protected taxpayers by holding schools accountable that engage in misconduct and ensuring that financially troubled schools provide the government with protection against the risks they create.

The Department's new rule would simply rescind and replace its 2016 Rule, reversing all of its enhanced protections for students and its accountability measures for for-profit schools. The Department's 2019 Rule provides an entirely unfair and unworkable process for defrauded students to obtain loan relief and will do nothing to deter and hold accountable schools that cheat their students. Among its numerous flaws, the Department's new rule places insurmountable evidentiary burdens on student borrowers with meritorious claims. The rule requires student borrowers to prove intentional or reckless misconduct on the part of their schools, an extraordinarily demanding standard not consistent with state laws governing liability for unfair and deceptive conduct. Moreover, even where a school has intentionally or recklessly harmed its students, it is difficult to imagine how students would be able to obtain the evidence necessary to prove intent or recklessness for an administrative application to the Department. The rule also inappropriately requires student borrowers to prove financial harm beyond the intrinsic harm caused by incurring federal student loan debt as a result of fraud, and establishes a three-year time bar on borrower defense claims, even though students typically do not learn until years later that they were defrauded by their schools. Compounding these obstacles, the rule arbitrarily eliminates the process by which relief can be sought on a group level, permitting those schools that have committed the most egregious and systemic misconduct to benefit from their wrongdoing at the expense of borrowers with meritorious claims who are unaware of or unable to access relief.

We are uniquely well-situated to understand the devastating effects that the 2019 Rule would have on the lives of student borrowers and their families. State attorneys general serve an important role in the regulation of private, postsecondary institutions. Our investigations and enforcement actions have repeatedly revealed that numerous for-

profit schools have deceived and defrauded students, and employed other unlawful tactics to line their coffers with federal student-loan funds. We have witnessed firsthand the heartbreaking devastation to borrowers and their families. Recently, for example, state attorneys general played a critical role in uncovering widespread misconduct at Career Education Corporation, Education Management Corporation, the Art Institute and Argosy schools operated by the Dream Center, ITT Technical Institute, Corinthian Colleges, American Career Institute and others, and then working with the Department to secure borrower-defense relief for tens of thousands of defrauded students. Though this work, we have spoken with numerous students who, while seeking new opportunities for themselves and their families, were lured into programs with the promise of employment opportunities and higher earnings, only to be left with little to show for their efforts aside from unaffordable debt.

A robust and fair borrower defense rule is critical for ensuring that student borrowers and taxpayers are not left bearing the costs of institutional misconduct. The Department's new rule instead empowers predatory for-profit schools and cuts off relief to victimized students. During the comment period on the 2019 Rule, we submitted these and other objections to the Department. Rather than engaging with our offices, the Department ignored our comments and left our concerns unaddressed. We commend and support your efforts to disapprove the 2019 Rule to protect students and taxpayers. Congress must hold predatory institutions accountable for their misconduct and provide relief to defrauded student borrowers and, by enacting your resolution of disapproval, ensure that the 2016 Rule remains the operative borrower defense regulation.

Sincerely,
Maura Healey, Massachusetts Attorney General; Kathleen Jennings, Delaware Attorney General; Clare E. Connors, Hawai'i Attorney General; Tom Miller, Iowa Attorney General; Brian E. Frosh, Maryland Attorney General; Keith Ellison, Minnesota Attorney General; Hector Balderas, New Mexico Attorney General; Xavier Becerra, California Attorney General; Karl A. Racine, District of Columbia Attorney General; Kwame Raoul, Illinois Attorney General; Aaron M. Frey, Maine Attorney General; Dana Nessel, Michigan Attorney General; Gurbir S. Grewal, New Jersey Attorney General; Letitia James, New York Attorney General; Joshua H. Stein, North Carolina Attorney General; Josh Shapiro, Pennsylvania Attorney General; Mark R. Herring, Virginia Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; Thomas J. Donovan, Jr., Vermont Attorney General; Bob Ferguson, Washington State Attorney General.

DECEMBER 9, 2019.

Senator DICK DURBIN,
Washington, DC.
Representative SUSIE LEE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN AND REPRESENTATIVE LEE: As 57 organizations representing and advocating for students, families, taxpayers, veterans and service members, faculty and staff, civil rights and consumers, we write in support of your efforts to disapprove the 2019 Borrower Defense to Repayment rule pursuant to the Congressional Review Act.

The purpose of the borrower defense rule as defined by the Higher Education Act is to protect students and taxpayers from fraud, deception, and other illegal misconduct by unscrupulous colleges. A well-designed rule

will both provide relief to students who have been lied to and cheated, and deter illegal conduct by colleges.

However, the final rule issued by the Department of Education on September 23, 2019, would accomplish neither of these goals. An analysis of the Department's own calculations estimates that only 3 percent of the loans that result from school misconduct would be cancelled under the new rule. Schools would be held accountable for reimbursing taxpayers for just 1 percent of these loans.

The DeVos Borrower Defense rule issued in September imposes unreasonable time limits on student borrowers who have been deceived and misled by their schools. It requires applicants to meet thresholds that make it almost impossible for wronged borrowers to obtain loan cancellation.

The rule eliminates the ability of groups of borrowers to be granted relief, even in cases where there is substantial compelling evidence of widespread wrongdoing. It prohibits the filing of claims after three years even when evidence of wrongdoing emerges at a later date. It requires borrowers to prove schools intended to deceive them or acted recklessly, although students have no ability to access evidence that might show this intent. And the rule stipulates that student loans taken by students under false pretenses are insufficient evidence of financial harm to allow the loans to be cancelled.

Additionally, the 2019 rule eliminates the promise of automatic loan relief to eligible students whose school closed before they could graduate. Instead, the Department would force each eligible student impacted by a school closure to individually find out about their statutory right to relief, apply, and navigate the government's bureaucracy to have their loans cancelled.

Many of us wrote to the Department in August 2018 in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking and offered carefully considered recommendations. However, the Department rejected our recommendations that would have provided a fair process that protects students and taxpayer dollars. Instead, the new rule would do little to provide relief to students who have been lied to, and even less to dissuade colleges from systematically engaging in deceptive and illegal recruitment tactics. Moreover, a borrower defense rule that fails to adequately protect students harms the most vulnerable students, including first-generation college students, Black and Latino students, and military-connected students, who are targeted by and disproportionately enroll in predatory for-profit colleges.

Meanwhile, the Department refuses to take action on a massive backlog of over 200,000 pending borrower defense claims, having failed to approve or deny a single claim in over a year. We fully support your effort to repeal the 2019 borrower defense rule, and look forward to restoration of the 2016 rule, which took major steps to provide a path to loan forgiveness for the hundreds of thousands of students who attended schools where misconduct has already been well documented.

Signed,

AFL-CIO, AFSCME, Allied Progress, American Association of University Professors, American Federation of Teachers, Americans for Financial Reform, Association of Young Americans (AYA), Campaign for America's Future, Center for Public Interest Law, Center for Responsible Lending, Children's Advocacy Institute, CLASP, Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, Consumer Action, Consumer Advocacy and Protection Society (CAPS) at Berkeley Law, Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Federal of California.

Demos, Duke Consumer Rights Project, East Bay Community Law Center, Economic Mobility Pathways (EMPath), The Education Trust, Empire Justice Center, Feminist Majority Foundation, Government Accountability Project, Higher Education Loan Coalition (HELCO), Hildreth Institute, Housing and Economic Rights Advocates, The Institute for College Access & Success (TICAS), Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition, NAACP, National Association for College Admission Counseling.

National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys (NACBA), National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients), National Education Association, National Urban League, New America Higher Education Program, New Jersey Citizen Action, One Wisconsin Now, PHENOM (Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts), Project on Predatory Student Lending, Public Citizen, Public Counsel.

Public Good Law Center, Public Law Center, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC), Student Debt Crisis, Student Defense, Student Veterans of America, Third Way, U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG), UnidosUS, Veterans Education Success, Veterans for Common Sense, Young Invincibles.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 76 and to reject Secretary DeVos' harmful rule that makes it nearly impossible for borrowers to seek the relief that they have the right to seek.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution disapproving the Administration's new "Borrowers Defense to Repayment" rule. This proposed rule would make it more difficult for defrauded students in my district to seek relief from their student loan obligations.

Over the past few years, we have seen large for-profit colleges close shop, leaving students with significant amounts of student debt and useless degrees. These closures included multiple campuses in North Texas, thus impacting thousands of students across the state. These students were falsely promised a better life if they obtained a degree from these institutions. However, because of these closures, students were worse off financially.

The Obama Administration proposed rules that would streamline the process for students to get discharged from their student loan obligations and be able to move on with their lives. Unfortunately, these rules were unable to go into effect due to Secretary DeVos's unlawful refusal to implement the Obama-era rule. Instead, Secretary DeVos has worked tirelessly to make the process for students seeking relief more burdensome.

The new Borrower's Defense rule makes it harder for borrowers to seek the relief they desperately need so that they can move on with their lives. The new rule drastically shortens the application period for borrowers to apply for relief, raises the bar that borrowers have to prove that an institution defrauded them, and allows instructions to access the evidence provided the borrower so that they have an advantage when attempting to undermine these claims.

Simply put, Secretary DeVos' Borrowers Defense rule rigs the game in favor of fraudulent

institutions while making life much more difficult for those students that were ripped off. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution so that we may use our Congressional Review Act authority to stop this rule before it ruins the livelihood of any more students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 790, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on:

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 180, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—231

Adams	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (TX)
Aguilar	Dean	Kaptur
Allred	DeFazio	Katko
Axne	DeGette	Keating
Barragán	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Bass	DelBene	Kennedy
Beatty	Delgado	Khanna
Bera	Demings	Kildee
Beyer	DeSaulnier	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Kim
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kind
Blunt Rochester	Doggett	Krishnamoorthi
Bonamici	Doyle, Michael	Kuster (NH)
Boyle, Brendan	F.	Lamb
Brindisi	Engel	Langevin
Brown (MD)	Escobar	Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Bustos	Espallat	Lawrence
Butterfield	Evans	Lawson (FL)
Carbajal	Finkenauer	Lee (CA)
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Lee (NV)
Carson (IN)	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Cartwright	Foster	Levin (MI)
Case	Frankel	Lieu, Ted
Casten (IL)	Fudge	Lipinski
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Loeb
Castro (TX)	Garcia (IL)	Loftgren
Chu, Judy	Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal
Cicilline	Golden	Lowe
Cisneros	Gomez	Lujan
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Luria
Clarke (NY)	Gottheimer	Lynch
Cleaver	Green, Al (TX)	Malinowski
Clyburn	Grijalva	Maloney,
Cohen	Haaland	Carolyn B.
Connolly	Harder (CA)	Maloney, Sean
Cooper	Hastings	Matsui
Correa	Hayes	McAdams
Costa	Heck	McBath
Courtney	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
Cox (CA)	Himes	McEachin
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	McGovern
Crist	Horsford	McNerney
Crow	Houlahan	Meeks
Cuellar	Hoyer	Meng
Cunningham	Huffman	Moore
Davids (KS)	Jackson Lee	Morelle
Davis (CA)	Jayapal	Moulton
Davis, Danny K.	Jeffries	Mucarsel-Powell
	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)

Nadler	Ruppersberger	Takano
Napolitano	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
Neguse	Sánchez	Titus
Norcross	Sarbanes	Tlaib
O'Halleran	Scanlon	Tonko
Ocasio-Cortez	Schakowsky	Torres (CA)
Omar	Schiff	Torres Small
Pallone	Schneider	(NM)
Panetta	Schrader	Trahan
Pappas	Schrier	Trone
Payne	Scott (VA)	Underwood
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Van Drew
Peters	Serrano	Vargas
Peterson	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Phillips	Shalala	Vela
Pingree	Sherman	Velázquez
Pocan	Sherrill	Visclosky
Porter	Sires	Wasserman
Pressley	Slotkin	Schultz
Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Quigley	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Raskin	Soto	Welch
Rice (NY)	Spanberger	Wexton
Richmond	Speier	Wild
Rose (NY)	Stanton	Wilson (FL)
Rouda	Stevens	Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard	Suozzi	Young
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	

NAYS—180

Abraham	Gosar	Olson
Aderholt	Granger	Palazzo
Allen	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Amash	Graves (LA)	Pence
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Perry
Armstrong	Green (TN)	Posey
Arrington	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Babin	Grothman	Reed
Bacon	Guest	Reschenthaler
Baird	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Balderson	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Banks	Harris	Roby
Barr	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Bergman	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Bost	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Brady	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rutherford
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Scalise
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Burchett	Jordan	Simpson
Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Calvert	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Carter (GA)	Keller	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Cheney	King (IA)	Steil
Cline	King (NY)	Steube
Cloud	Kinzinger	Stewart
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Collins (GA)	LaHood	Taylor
Comer	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Latta	Timmons
Curtis	Long	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Lucas	Turner
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Wagner
Duncan	Massie	Walberg
Dunn	Mast	Walden
Emmer	McCarthy	Walorski
Estes	McCaul	Waltz
Ferguson	McHenry	Watkins
Fleischmann	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Flores	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Meuser	Wenstrup
Fox (NC)	Miller	Westerman
Fulcher	Mitchell	Williams
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gianforte	Mullin	Womack
Gibbs	Murphy (NC)	Woodall
Gohmert	Newhouse	Wright
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Yoho
Gooden	Nunes	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (UT)	Gallego	Marchant
Byrne	Holding	McClintock
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Pascrell
Cook	Lesko	Roy
Crawford	Lewis	Spano
Gabbard	Loudermilk	Walker

□ 1057

Mr. GAETZ changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the record that on January 16, 2020, I missed one roll call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted: yea on rollcall Vote 22, H.J. Res. 76.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 22.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I missed one vote on January 16, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 22.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 133. An act to promote economic partnership and cooperation between the United States and Mexico.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 801

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR: Mr. Van Drew.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Taylor.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Van Drew.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORELLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

□ 1100

RECOGNIZING THE WEST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL CHEERLEADERS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate some exceptional young people from my district, the cheerleaders from West Orange High School, known as the Mountaineers.

They have one dream this year. They wanted to compete in the National Cheerleading Championships. They knew it wouldn't be easy. It would require hours of practice. They would have to work and make every routine perfect, and they would have to defy expectations.

They went to the regional qualifier in Pennsylvania with one goal, and when the routines were done and the points were counted, they earned a trip to the national championships.

In February they are off to Walt Disney World Resort in Orlando to battle with the best high school cheerleading squads in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope they bring home that trophy to West Orange. But whether they do or not, they will always be champions to me and all of us in the 10th District of New Jersey.

CONGRATULATING PATTI PRICE ON HER RETIREMENT

(Mrs. MILLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the hard work of Patricia Price, who has devoted the past 42 years to Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Tri-State, an organization in Huntington, West Virginia, which provides volunteer mentors for children in adverse living situations.

Patti came to Big Brothers Big Sisters in 1978 fresh out of graduate school with a servant's heart. She started as a case worker, eventually rising to become the executive director. Throughout her career she committed herself to developing a consistent, encouraging, and safe environment for underprivileged children in our region.

Under her leadership, Patti organized hundreds of volunteers and staff, and created countless successful fundraising initiatives. Through these efforts, Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Tri-State has grown to provide mentorship for over 160 children every year.

As she moves into the next phase of her life, Patti leaves behind a legacy of

compassion, selflessness, and perseverance. Patti Price has changed the lives of thousands, and we are all so grateful for her work.

CONGRATULATING LSU ON WINNING NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

(Mr. RICHMOND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a group of young men who had an excellent undefeated season at LSU and won the national championship.

I also rise to congratulate Coach Orgeron for his leadership in shaping not only those young men on the field, but off the field also.

I also take great pride, Mr. Speaker, in recognizing one outstanding individual on that team, his name is Grant Delpit.

Grant Delpit was my first batboy at the congressional baseball game. Last year he was the unanimous All-American, and this year he caused a fumble in the national championship game. But more importantly, his parents, a lawyer, law enforcement, and his grandmother serves on the board of a charter school in my district. They are an exceptional family.

Mr. Speaker, we have a commitment that when we see our young people doing well that we recognize them and congratulate them. So, to all of the outstanding young men at LSU for winning the national championship, and to Grant Delpit for excelling in the classroom, off and on the field, I just want to say congratulations, we recognize you. And good luck in whatever you do in your future.

CONGRATULATING THE WESTLAKE CHAPARRALS ON THEIR STATE CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the 2019 Westlake High School Chaparrals football team on winning their second State championship title.

For Texans, high school football isn't just a sport, it is a way of life. Each week in the fall we gather under Friday night lights and cheer our team on to victory. The young men, women, and coaches on our team spend countless hours running drills, watching film, and getting ready for their moment in history.

During the 2019 season, Westlake's dedication paid off as they posted a 24-0 shutout over Denton Guyer at AT&T Stadium for their second State title.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 25th Congressional District in Texas, I congratulate the Chaps on their victory and wish them the very best in their bright futures.

In God we trust.

TIME TO HELP OUR FELLOW AMERICANS IN PUERTO RICO

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it was over 2 years ago that Hurricane Maria hit the island of Puerto Rico, and our fellow Americans sustained one of the worst natural disasters, with the highest death toll in modern history. Now we have, again, earthquakes hitting the island since December 28 to this date.

I got to go this week and saw firsthand schools crumbling. I saw folks sitting out in tents who need emergency housing and mental health services. Yet we still have less than half the money that we allocated for Hurricane Maria actually down on the island.

It is time for the Trump administration to bring that money down.

In addition, it is time to declare a major disaster declaration. We cannot let this tragedy happen again. America is watching. History is watching. It is time to help our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico.

RECOGNIZING TALENTED ALL-AMERICAN GAMES WOMEN BASKETBALL PLAYERS

(Mr. WALTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize three talented high school basketball players in my district, Khadija Faye, Tiera White, and Brianna Ellis.

Khadija and Tiera play basketball at Father Lopez High School in Daytona Beach, and Brianna plays basketball at Flagler Palm Coast High School in Palm Coast, Florida. All three of these young women have just been nominated to play in the 2020 All-American Games, a national basketball competition benefiting the Ronald McDonald charities. They were among 46 seniors from Florida to be selected for this honor.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize their hard work and talent on the House floor today. The final roster will be announced next week, and we are all hoping all three will be on it.

I know I speak on behalf of all of us when I say we are so proud and so excited to see Daytona and Palm Coast represented so well in women's basketball.

RELIEF FOR DEFAUDED STUDENTS

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the passage of H.J. Res. 76, a resolution to overturn Secretary DeVos' shameful borrower defense rule.

Secretary DeVos claims her rule is to help students and to protect taxpayers, but this rule does the complete opposite.

Instead of working on behalf of students that have been defrauded by predatory for-profit colleges, Secretary DeVos seeks to protect those bad actors who leave students with crushing debt and worthless degrees.

Secretary DeVos refuses to provide relief to defrauded students, eliminates consumer protections and higher education, and weakens safeguards to prevent low quality schools from receiving taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I was proud to vote for and help pass H.J. Res. 76 to overturn Secretary DeVos' anti-student rule, and I urge prompt action by the full Senate.

ADDRESSING SUICIDE PREVENTION

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the Suicide Prevention Act.

I read this statistic on the House floor before, but it bears repeating: every 9 minutes someone in the United States commits suicide. And for every suicide-related death, there are 25 attempts. These are truly heartbreaking statistics, and they hit close to home.

I have met with the family and friends of those who have taken their own life. I have heard their stories and I am responding to their pleas for help.

This bill is part of a longstanding commitment to reverse this troubling trend. It is bipartisan, it is bicameral, and it would provide for new resources to turn the tide on this dire situation.

Part of the problem when it comes to effectively addressing suicide is that medical and other professionals have outdated resources and stale data. The current data collection efforts regarding suicide are often years out of date, and this limits the ability of State and local health organizations, as well as community organizations, to recognize the trends early and intervene.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues here in the House and the Senate to respond to those who are crying for help. This legislation makes so much sense, we should make it a priority.

SKYROCKETING PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

(Ms. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago I started a healthcare listening tour across Minnesota's Second Congressional District. Whether it is Wabasha or Burnsville, the issue is the same.

The cost of lifesaving prescription drugs is skyrocketing. Over the past 2

decades, the cost of insulin has risen 600 percent, a lifesaving drug that more than 350,000 Minnesotans rely on.

That is unacceptable and that is why I have introduced the Emergency Access to Insulin Act, to make insulin more affordable, and hold big drug companies accountable for jacking up insulin prices and making other lifesaving drugs unaffordable for Minnesota families.

Over the past 10 years, the cost of Canasa, a medicine for Crohn's disease, has increased by 150 percent. That is why I have cosponsored 61 bills to address skyrocketing healthcare costs.

We do not have the luxury of standing by any longer while 3 in 10 Minnesotans are rationing their medicine. It is time to sit down with my colleagues and lower the cost of healthcare.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MAYOR DEBBIE JOHNSON

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Ms. Debbie Johnson, who passed away from complications due to an illness on Monday, January 13.

At the time of her passing, Ms. JOHNSON was serving as mayor pro tem of Port Wentworth in the First Congressional District of Georgia. Mayor pro tem Johnson's colleagues remember her as a larger-than-life figure, who served the city with the utmost dedication to the people she represented.

For 17 years she worked at Savannah-Chatham Metropolitan Police Department before becoming one of the first African American women ever elected to the Port Wentworth City Council.

While mayor pro tem, she fought for the voices of the unheard and made fundamental rights and equality a top priority. One of her most important projects included coordinating events to feed the hungry during Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor pro tem Johnson's work and presence will be deeply missed in Port Wentworth. Her family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

□ 1115

MARKING ROE V. WADE 47TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the 47th anniversary of Roe v. Wade on January 22, I rise for the 1-in-4 women in America who have had an abortion, and the 1-in-3 women living in a State where abortion would be banned if Roe was overturned.

On March 4, the Supreme Court will hear June Medical Services v. Gee. The Louisiana law requiring admitting privileges would leave just one clinic open and one physician to provide all the abortions in Louisiana.

Although Roe is the law of the land, 27 States impose waiting periods, 12 ban private insurance coverage, 18 mandate counseling, and 43 have abortion-ban laws ready to go.

Mr. Speaker, to those waging war on the rights of women, next week is the anniversary of the Women's March. We have seen the power women wield when they march to the ballot box. Get ready for 2020 because we are not going back.

ROE V. WADE DECISION DEPRIVES STATES' RIGHTS

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago, the Supreme Court of the United States incorrectly decided Roe v. Wade. Since then, the rights of States to determine whether or not they will provide unborn children the same right to life and liberty as those outside the womb has been eliminated.

Since then, 61 million American children have been killed without a say and without due process. Since then, the Supreme Court has effectively tied the hands of those with compassion by depriving States the ability to protect life.

Justice Antonin Scalia, in his dissent in Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey, saw the harm in this, saying: "By foreclosing all democratic outlet for the deep passions this issue arouses, by banishing the issue from the political forum that gives all participants, even the losers, the satisfaction of a fair hearing and an honest fight, by continuing the imposition of a rigid national rule instead of allowing for regional differences, the Court merely prolongs and intensifies the anguish."

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree with the late Justice Scalia more.

HONORING JEANETTE PEDONE ON HER RETIREMENT AS ASSISTANT CHIEF CLERK OF DEBATES

(Mr. CONNOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeanette Pedone on her recent retirement as our Assistant Chief Clerk of Debates, after nearly 17 years of service here in the House.

Jeanette grew up along the eastern seaboard but always enjoyed her summers in Harvey Cedars, New Jersey. She attended the Fashion Institute of Technology and the New York School of Interior Design. Jeanette came to the House from the Stenograph Com-

pany, where she was a sales representative. She first served as an editor for committee hearings in the Office of Official Reporters in 2003, and she became an Assistant Chief Clerk of Debates a year later.

Jeanette was a debate clerk for more than 16 years, the longest job she ever held, and served under four Speakers of the House, four Clerks of the House, and four Chiefs of the Office of Official Reporters.

As a debate clerk, she coordinated the production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the floor of the House, recording who spoke on the floor and all parliamentary actions of the House, a pretty big job. She also assisted the official reporters and editors in gathering speeches and supplemental information for the RECORD.

Jeanette was a familiar face on the floor and had a front-row seat to history. She represented the office at a State of the Union Address, five speeches to joint meetings of Congress by foreign leaders, and many important legislative moments here on the floor. But she most fondly recalls meeting her childhood idol, Patty Duke, and her son, the actor Sean Astin, when they toured the House floor late one night after adjournment.

Jeanette retired to Lords Valley, Pennsylvania, with her husband, Joe. She looks forward to spending more time with her family, including her daughter, Courtney, and her son, Jeff. She also now has two baby granddaughters to shower with attention.

Mr. Speaker, we wish Jeanette all the best on behalf of the entire House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATING REFUGIO HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. CLOUD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Refugio High School Bobcats football team for winning their fifth State championship. The Bobcats had a 16-0 record this year on the way to the Class 2A Division 1 championship game, where they won 28-7.

What makes this win extra special is that Refugio was one of the hardest hit communities by Hurricane Harvey. Initially, the vast majority of students was homeless, and football games were delayed as the school and stadium were repaired. While the damage to homes, schools, and businesses in that community were devastating, the spirit of Refugio remained strong.

Head coach Jason Herring consistently gives all the credit to the kids who put in the hours and showed up to get their work done. He has played a big role in helping these students fulfill their potential. All in all, it was an awesome year for the team.

In Refugio, winning football games is part of the legacy that goes to building

that strong community, and I look forward to seeing what the team does next year.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the players, coaches, families, and the entire Refugio community on this achievement.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO WILLIE BELTON

(Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Willie Belton, a political leader, successful businessman, and decorated war veteran who passed away on January 8, 2020.

Born and raised in Basile, Louisiana, Mr. Belton went on to serve in the United States Army and was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart for his heroic acts of sacrifice. Later, he received the Louisiana Veterans Honor Medal in gratitude for his faithful service.

Mr. Belton was also a monumental figure within the civil rights movement. In 1960, he was chosen to lead a local NAACP chapter and worked alongside some of history's heroes, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to put an end to racial discrimination and ensure equal opportunity for all.

Mr. Belton was the first African American in Evangeline Parish to run for State representative in a predominantly white district. Even though he didn't end up winning that election, he made an enormous impact on the State of Louisiana by breaking down barriers, extinguishing fear, and paving the way for those who followed.

Our prayers are with the Belton family as they grieve the loss of an American hero. His service to this country and his active commitment to social justice will never be forgotten.

May he rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING EAGLE SCOUT EVAN MICHAEL HOLMES

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize Evan Michael Holmes from Troop 95 in Upper Township on the attainment of his Eagle Scout rank. Eagle Scout is the highest rank obtainable from the Boy Scouts of America, and only 4 percent of all boys ever achieve this prestigious recognition.

Eagle Scouts are more likely to dedicate their life to service, and his service is very special. He is planning to join the Navy in February 2020. I was proud of Evan's beautiful Court of Honor that was celebrated earlier this month, and I congratulate Evan.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of Evan and look forward to big things in the future from him. Some of us look for

heroes in celebrities—God help us. Some look for heroes here in Washington—equally, God help us. But my heroes are individuals, young men like Evan, who do more, who work harder, and who know what it is to be a true American and a good person, who really care for and love their families and the people around them.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Evan the very best, and may God bless him.

THANKING TRUMP ADMINISTRATION FOR DEFENDING UNBORN

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as pro-life, pro-family, and pro-child. No matter what your faith is, everyone understands that life is very precious and that life is a gift.

I believe that as Members of Congress and, really, as all citizens, we are called to protect the vulnerable, and this is one of my core beliefs. Being pro-life means not just pro-birth but being interested in the welfare of the child during his or her entire formative years.

That is why I am not only a longtime member of the Pro-Life Caucus but also the co-chair of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank this administration for the work they have done to defend the unborn, including changing the rules for title 10 and expanding the Mexico City policy. I look forward to continuing to work with the administration on these issues as we come to the time of January when we remember the ruling on *Roe v. Wade*.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when there are no more abortions because there are no more unwanted children.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 15, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND MORAL AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

PROTECTING OUR WATERS AND COMMUNITIES

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the House passed H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019. This important legislation marks a critical step forward in addressing the public health crisis caused by so-called forever chemicals like PFAS.

According to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, certain compounds of PFAS, like PFOA and PFOS, are known to cause liver damage, thyroid disease, asthma, birth defects, and even some cancers.

Unfortunately, for many in northeast Wisconsin, this fight is personal and tragic. Anyone who has been to our small corner of the country knows that water is part of what makes northeast Wisconsin so special and beautiful. Unfortunately, this water, which is so central to our way of life, is under threat from chemicals like PFOA and PFOS.

While until recently, PFAS was an unknown contaminant. Recent studies give us a better understanding of the risks posed by compounds like PFOA and PFOS. Not only have our communities been unwittingly placed at risk by these toxins, but it has taken far too long to get them the resources required to mitigate their effects.

As a result, these toxic chemicals have contaminated local water sources and literally poisoned the well from which Wisconsinites drink.

No one should be afraid to drink or use the water from their tap. The fact that this is the case for many across the country, including in northeast Wisconsin, and in Peshtigo, in particular, means one thing: We must act with a sense of urgency to defend our communities and protect the clean water that underpins our way of life.

As a member of the PFAS Task Force, I am committed to finding ways to combat PFAS and its negative effects on our communities.

Last year, Representative DELGADO and I introduced the PFAS Right-to-Know Act, a bipartisan bill that would require PFAS to be listed on the Toxics Release Inventory and require manufacturers, processors, and producers to report their usage of PFAS chemicals to the EPA.

Signed into law last month as part of the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act, this bill provides communities with a better understanding of where these toxins come from so we can better combat their effects. While this was an important first step, there is more to be done.

The PFAS Action Act builds on last year's progress through a number of important provisions. It designates

PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances to ensure that all those responsible for contamination do their part to clean up and restore our waters and habitats. It establishes stronger drinking water standards to give States and communities the resources they need to mitigate contamination. It strengthens the Clean Water Act to include PFOS and PFOA as toxic pollutants.

This legislation will be critical in protecting waters in northeast Wisconsin and across the country for current and future generations. When it comes to the PFAS crisis, I would simply argue to my own colleagues who may be skeptical of which direction we need to go or the need for the Federal Government to get involved that inaction is not an option.

The PFAS Action Act is a thorough, comprehensive, and long-overdue solution, and I want to thank Representatives PALLONE and DINGELL for their leadership, as well as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in protecting our water and our communities.

□ 1130

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here in the House of Representatives and have an opportunity to speak, as so many places around the world don't have those privileges, those rights.

Sometimes people ask, well, if the rights are truly endowed by our creator, then why don't people have them all over the world?

And it is an endowment, these rights, like an inheritance; but the only way you get to keep any inheritance is if you are willing to fight for it, because, if you are not, in this world, evil people will always be trying to take what you have and take it for themselves.

So we have been blessed to be in a country where we had men and women willing to stand up and fight for us.

My 4 years in the Army, we were never in combat. I still think we should have gone, in 1979, to Iran; and if we had addressed the attack on our American property, which was the U.S. Embassy, then the Ayatollah would have been gone, and there would be tens of thousands of Americans still alive today. It is just very unfortunate.

But at least Soleimani is no longer around to kill Americans and to dream up new devices, whether improvised or exploding devices to kill and maim Americans.

It is one of the great ironies that the lead terrorist in the world, Soleimani, who ordered, directed, got the best architects to design instruments to inflict casualties on Americans—and there were more Americans killed or wounded on that road in from the airport in Iraq.

Some may remember, back in the early days of the war in Iraq, that the most dangerous place we kept hearing was on that road in from the airport. There were so many IEDs and explosive

devices that killed, maimed our American military, and they were set to kill and maim American military. That was after Soleimani had taken over the IRGC and he had his special troops.

But he was a terrorist. He had been allowed to keep finding ways to kill Americans for far too long, and the world is a better place without him.

It was amazing that people on both sides of the aisle could agree on that when President Obama ordered the killing of Osama bin Laden, and yet so many of those same people with whom we agreed thought it was atrocious that President Trump would order the taking out of the lead terrorist killing hundreds of Americans. It is just a strange thing.

Some call it Trump Derangement Syndrome. They just have so much hatred for our current President that it doesn't matter that it is in direct conflict with what they have said before.

For example, our chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the minority leader in the Senate had some pretty strong quotes back when President Clinton was impeached, and now they both say 180-degree opposite things, completely contradicting themselves about what impeachment should be and not be.

So it is clear, though, from the Constitution—this is the last sentence of Article II. It says: "The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason"—that is a crime—"bribery"—that is a crime—"or other high crimes"—those are crimes—"and misdemeanors"—and those are crimes.

So it is very clear, if you are going to impeach and then convict and remove a President from office, there need to have been crimes. In every one of the prior impeachments—there have only been a few—the allegations involved crimes.

Perjury, as President Clinton was guilty of, is a crime. He was not prosecuted. There still seemed to be a permanent feeling that you couldn't convict a sitting President of a crime. But he paid a very heavy price, being disbarred for perjury and other costs that he had to pay.

But, unfortunately, we now live in a time where right and wrong are supposed to be so relative. It all depends. The ends justify the means. That is the way you lose a great civilization. That is the way you lose moral authority, when right and wrong all become relative.

In fact, John Adams, as President, in 1797, our second President, made very clear when he said this Constitution is meant for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any other.

If we are going to continue to allow schools to teach relativity of right and wrong and that ends justify the means, you can be mean and evil and hateful so long as your hate and evil conduct is aimed at somebody that you call hateful.

So we have developed quite a quandary here in the United States where so many people—and I know some have said: Oh, I don't hate anybody. But President Trump obviously drives them crazy and spurs them to do and say things they wouldn't normally do and say, and they certainly didn't with President Clinton when he was caught actually lying under oath.

So we have got to get back to teaching right and wrong. There is a right; there is a wrong.

And I know some people say: Well, I am a Christian and, therefore, I know God is love, and, therefore, I love everybody, and that is just the way God is.

But I would direct attention to Psalm 6, beginning with verse 16. It points out that there are actually some things that God hates, and one is a lying tongue; one is a heart that devises wicked schemes; one is a person who stirs up conflict in the community. And, frankly, we had that among some people who conspired to eliminate a sitting President.

Actually, they started out conspiring to use taxpayer funds to use the FBI, intelligence community, even some defense funds, State Department personnel and funds, to prevent Donald Trump from being elected. And then after he was elected, those guns were turned on him to try to eliminate him from office.

Obviously, in the current impeachment, there is no treason; there is no bribery; there is no high crime; there is no misdemeanor. So those pushing these Articles of Impeachment, abuse of power and obstruction of Congress, actually ended up being guilty of both of those allegations.

But they are not crimes; they are not high crimes; they are not misdemeanors; they are not bribery. But they are guilty of those themselves.

If you go back, as I am thrilled that so many of my friends across the aisle are doing now, quoting our Founders, they made clear in those early debates that you could not, you should not, could not be able to remove a President or someone because you don't like the way they are doing things or maladministration; or you think they are not doing something quickly enough and so you would say they are obstructing Congress; or you don't like the way they did something so you would say: Oh, they are abusing their power—even though the Obama administration did the very same things, just much worse.

I thought it was worse when I met with a big group of weeping Nigerian mothers whose children were kidnapped and chained to beds, normally raped multiple times a day, from what we were told. I asked the pastor who was trying to assist so many of these Nigerian women: Where are the fathers?

He said: That is part of the tragedy. The fathers know that their little girls are chained to beds and being raped

every day, and they don't feel like they should stay in a bed when they were not able to protect their daughters.

And I have got to give it to the Obama administration. They did hold up a sign and say #bringbackourgirls. But from what Nigerians in government there were telling me, they were told: If you really want us to take out Boko Haram for you, we have got the power; we have got the money; we have got the military might; but you are going to have to change your laws to allow abortion and to allow same-sex marriage. And if you are not going to do that, we are not going to help you like we could with Boko Haram.

I saw a quote from a Catholic bishop in Nigeria who was basically saying: Our religious beliefs are not for sale, not to President Obama, to John Kerry, to America. They are not for sale.

So some of us were concerned that we could have helped stop some of the biggest atrocities going on in the world by radical Islam, but money was withheld. Help was withheld in order to achieve a political agenda regarding same-sex marriage and abortion, according to people I met with there in Nigeria, and seemed to be bolstered by articles that have been read back at that time.

We also know that this Congress has repeatedly, since I have been here, made clear we don't want to be giving away money to countries that are going to use it for improper purposes.

Now, of course, that changed a great deal during the Obama administration. We are willing to give \$150 billion to people that we knew there is a decent chance they were going to be using it to kill Americans and to terrorize the world, maybe use it, some of it, to pursue nuclear weapons. We have been hearing that some of it was used by Soleimani to help coordinate attacks against Americans around the Middle East because they want Americans out of the Middle East.

But I have had a bill in most of the Congresses in which I have been a Member called the United Nations Voting Accountability Act, and it put requirements on our money.

□ 1145

I almost got it passed as an amendment early on. It just simply basically says any nation that votes against the United States' position in the U.N. more than half of the time shall receive no assistance of any kind from the United States in the subsequent year. It seems like in March, somewhere around there, we get the voting results from the prior year from the U.N. and you can go through and see what percentage of the time each country voted with us and when they voted against us.

I think it would be a great requirement to put on our financial aid, and as I have said repeatedly since I have been here in Congress, you don't have to pay people to hate you, they will do it for free. You don't have to pay them

to hate you, they are perfectly happy to hate you for free.

And as I found from being very small in elementary school, you don't win the respect of a bully by giving them your lunch money or giving them whatever they demand. You have to make them pay a price. Even if you don't win the war, if you hurt them—of course, they hurt you worse—they decide they will pick on somebody else because they don't want to get hurt themselves, and they know you will fight back.

It is nice here in the United States, we are big and strong enough we can take it to bullies, terrorists like Soleimani, and I thank God that he is gone and there will be Americans living as a result of him being gone.

So Trump derangement syndrome has caused the House majority to push through two Articles of Impeachment. We heard for 3 years all of this Russia collusion. As most of us know who have had legal training, collusion is not normally a crime, unless it is with regard to stocks. Normally the term is used as conspiracy, a criminal conspiracy. Somebody came up with a brilliant idea of using the word "collusion," and let's accuse Donald Trump of doing exactly what we have done.

Why else would the President of the United States say to the President of Russia, Tell Vladimir I will have a lot more flexibility after the next election? So they could give in a lot more than he even had in the past.

It is called projecting. You engage in improper conduct and then accuse your opponent of engaging in what you did. That is exactly what we have seen here, projecting.

So you have somebody that gets paid off by corrupt entities in Ukraine, and they turn around—and when the President of the United States does his job and basically says to Ukraine—when they elect a president who got elected on the basis that he was going to end corruption—if you have got evidence of corruption, we sure would like to see it if it involves American people. You know, please, we would like to see what you got if it involves Americans. There is nothing wrong with that. It is perfectly legal.

If you listen to the contention of some people we have heard in Washington, the contention basically is: You may have committed a crime or engaged in corrupt activity, if you will just run for President then we will defend you, saying, you can't go after that person, he is running for President. You are trying to use your office for political purposes. That way somebody that engages in corruption and keeps running for President can never be prosecuted because we will defend you because you shouldn't be prosecuted, you are running for President. So we can say your position is being used for political purposes, where actually if somebody is engaged in corruption it ought to be investigated.

Look what has happened as a result of this Ukraine hoax; it scared a lot of

people to death, including people that have worked with Ukraine in our National Security Council who were aware of some of the money passing back and forth with Americans. And what do they do: Oh, my gosh, what are we going to do? We are going the get caught up in this investigation. Oh, I know, we will claim that when the President asked for evidence of corruption by Americans that that is some kind of quid pro quo. And even though it is perfectly consistent with the President keeping his oath, we will allow that to just be hammered over and over again, so maybe we can convince the Ukrainian President if he provides the evidence of corruption by Americans then that means the President is guilty of some crime.

They have actually been very successful in backing President Zelensky and Ukraine off of investigating crimes of corruption by American individuals.

That is a real victory. No matter what happens on impeachment in the Senate, it is a real victory for those who were engaged, participated in potential corruption with Ukraine, because they have been able to turn the tables, accuse President Trump, and then back the Ukrainian President off from investigating their corruption, and all of the focus is on President Trump instead of on those who may be guilty of high crimes, including bribery. It has been interesting to see the way that has politically played out.

We are told constantly, there is breaking news, the President should not have sat on that money to Ukraine. There was nothing illegal about holding up the money. And if I were President, I would be holding up any money that was going to any country that engaged in or where there was rampant corruption, as we knew had gone on in Ukraine, and require them to produce evidence that they were actually trying to stop corruption. Since the corruption seemed to involve American individuals, we have now stopped that investigation by Ukraine into the corruption by Americans, and that means that Ukraine is not going to be rid of corruption because they haven't been able to adequately pursue it. There is no breaking news. There is nothing new if people reporting it were fair.

Again, one good thing from my standpoint about the Trump derangement syndrome, we knew there were lots of bad actors among deep staters in the State Department, in the Intel community, in the FBI at the top, at the DOJ, some of the top people, but it was hard to identify them. Well, because of the hatred for Donald Trump that is just in-articulable, it is so deranging to those that have this level of despising the President they keep raising their heads, so we know who the people are that are willing to abuse their office and violate their oath to the Constitution and loyalty to our own government.

I didn't hear the first part of Lieutenant Colonel Vindman—I have got

family members that are lieutenant colonels, I have known so many serving in the military, in the Army, but he is the only one that I ever heard get high, righteous, and mighty and demand to be called lieutenant colonel, even though most days he doesn't wear a uniform. But he certainly wore one so people that don't normally respect the military, as well as some of us that do, they would go on and on about him being a part of the military.

I asked my staff to get me the transcript of his testimony, and I got it before he had finished, and I am reading through and I am going, My word, Vindman has been violating his oath to his own Constitution. And he certainly is not being loyal to the President when the President is not committing a crime. He is clearly being more loyal to Ukraine.

Then you find out later, well, actually, he was admonished because a superior officer heard him bad-mouthing the United States to some Russians. But that is why it came as no surprise to me. I was thinking he is more loyal to Ukraine than he is to the United States. It was no big surprise when I found out that Vindman was offered the position in Ukraine of defense minister three times, because clearly he had shown the Ukrainian leaders that he was more loyal to them than he was to his own U.S. leaders. That might be a good move for him at some point since he appears to have more loyalty to Ukraine. He may want to take them up on that at some point. Obviously, he would want to wait until after the impeachment trial is over.

I know there are some that want to have live witnesses in the Senate Chamber, just make it a full-blown circus. We should have had live witnesses in the House. That is what they did during the Clinton impeachment. You had fact witnesses that testified before the Judiciary Committee, however, we had a bunch of opinions coming in.

We didn't get the real fact witnesses. And of course, the real fact witnesses, in my mind, would include Alexandra Chalupa, the actions and antics she was involved in, along with Eric Ciaramella, Abigail Grace, and Sean Misko; they had both worked at the National Security Council. They have a lot of information about work with Ukraine, real facts, not just made up stuff, but real facts. They would have been important to get under oath. I still think they would be.

Andrew McCarthy, just a superb former prosecutor, had an article yesterday or today talking about the Senate should just say we are not taking up impeachment until you finish. You want us to do the investigation that you didn't do in the House because you were in such a hurry to get it to the Senate. We are not going to do your investigation, you don't have a high crime, you don't have a misdemeanor, you don't have treason, you don't have bribery. So why don't you go back, and if you come up with a high crime, mis-

demeanor, bribery, or treason then come see us once you have actually got evidence of something like that.

Unfortunately, the House passed impeachment even though it didn't rise to the level of impeachable offenses. It is an allegation of maladministration, which the Founders said should never be a basis for impeachment, and that is why they didn't include those types of things as a basis for impeachment. That is what they have alleged, and that is what is now down at the Senate straight down the hall. The Senate is going to take them up. I agree with my friend, Andy McCarthy. The Senate should not do the House's job.

The House had thousands of pages of transcripts. I sure wish they would release the Inspector General's deposition, but of course, that is why they did it down in the SCIF. None of the information we were told was classified. The witnesses were told if you have any answer that may involve classified information, just don't answer, which is also a cue, don't answer any questions Republicans ask that you don't want to answer. And that was the reason that so often Republican questions were interrupted with instructions to the witness by the chairman of Intel. That is why Intel did it. They wanted to have them in secret even though they weren't classified, have them in a place where most of us could not be there, including people like those of us on the Judiciary Committee, the true committee of jurisdiction.

□ 1200

Then they could leak out what they thought might be helpful, even if they were leaks that were not accurate about what was actually testified to, and certainly out of context, to try to build this feeling that the President had done something terrible.

Again, this has been going on for 3 years, the investigation. We have been told since the day after President Trump was elected that they were going to impeach him. They didn't know what for, but they were going to find something.

As Senator SCHUMER said back I believe it was in 1998 or 1999, during the Clinton impeachment, he pointed out that the Clinton impeachment—even though, as I say, it involved an actual crime of perjury, the Clinton impeachment lowered the bar. He said now it will be too easy to go after a President and impeach him for a minor crime like perjury.

Well, he had no idea how low the bar would be made by the Democrats. Now, it really is dangerous because they have shown you don't have to have a crime. All you have to have is a majority in the House and you can help destroy at least 3-plus years of a President's term by keeping them under a cloud the whole time.

I didn't initially support Donald Trump as a candidate, but I really think people believed if we can just go after his family, go after him, go after

business and friends, 6 months in, he will resign. He will say: "I am going back to making money. You can forget this. I don't need this," and walk away, but they just didn't know President Trump. He was not going to walk away. He could see this country was in big trouble.

As Newt Gingrich has said, if Hillary Clinton had been elected, we would never have known the extent of the corruption in these departments.

Now we find out even in Defense, as Adam Lovinger found, they were paying hundreds of thousands of dollars, I think over a million dollars, to a guy named Stefan Halper. It didn't look like there was anything they were getting back, and that was his job. Ultimately, they don't question Halper's involvement with the Defense Department, making all this money, getting rich helping the Defense Department as a professor over in London.

Little did Adam Lovinger know that he was doing work for a number of departments by trying to set up Carter Page, setting up Papadopoulos, and just helping out trying to bring down a candidate and then bring down a President.

Even the Defense Department got into this effort to prevent the election and then to remove a sitting President. Historically, that is called a coup d'etat. Sometimes, it is without violence.

In this case, of course, we found out there was violence at Trump events, and they blamed Trump for that. Then we find out, in a secret recording, a Democratic operative said: Yeah, we are the ones that hire people to go in and start fights so that we can accuse Trump supporters of being violent.

That is also a tactic of the Muslim Brotherhood. It is what they have done in Egypt. They had the largest peaceful uprising in the history of the world protesting against a Muslim Brother, Morsi, who was shredding their Constitution. They arose, demanded he be removed. The Muslim Brotherhood went out, started violence, burned down some churches and synagogues. Then CNN and others faithfully reported that it was the protestors and not the Muslim Brotherhood that did that.

But it was amazing what the people of Egypt did in their peaceful protests against a man shredding the Constitution, much as our Department of Justice and FBI top people have done over the last 4 years.

Some have said they only began to investigate the Trump campaign in July 2016, but we know it was months before that.

It looks like they were probably investigating different campaigns, trying to figure out ways, if that person won the Republican nomination, then they would come after them as well. I don't have any doubt that would have happened.

As former Speaker Gingrich has said, we wouldn't have had any idea just how

corrupt the intel and these other folks had become.

If you want a real fact witness, it ought to be Brennan and Clapper. Of course, we saw how comfortable they have been lying under oath when testifying before Congress. It would be nice if they were held accountable.

It would be nice if Koskinen had been held accountable, if Loretta Lynch had been held accountable, because right now, after all these abuses during the Obama years, people got very arrogant about their abuses of their positions, and nobody has been made to pay. That needs to happen.

But we don't need to have people who are comfortable lying under oath come down to testify at a big circus in the Senate Chamber. They should adopt exactly what they did under the Clinton rules.

If they have witnesses, depose them, use the testimony from the depositions. Senators from both parties can submit questions to be asked, but they ought to follow exactly the rules exactly the way they did during the Clinton impeachment. They shouldn't be taking new witnesses.

Like Andy McCarthy says, the Senate should not be asked to do the job that the House should have done but did not. He is exactly right about that.

I would encourage, Mr. Speaker, and I hope, the Senate will hold to those rules. They were rules that were demanded and agreed to under the Clinton impeachment during the Clinton administration. They seemed to have been fair rules back then. They ought to enforce them exactly the same way: no live witnesses in the Chamber. That is not the place to have an investigation.

There is no high crime; there is no misdemeanor. None of those were charged.

We heard about bribery. We heard about Russia, Russia, Russia. We know that the real crimes regarding Russia were committed by Christopher Steele; potentially the DNC; and the Clinton campaign, which paid Fusion GPS, which paid Christopher Steele, who worked possibly with—he said, yeah, it is possible that maybe they worked for Putin, the people he got his information from. Maybe they were involved with Ukraine. We are not sure.

Obviously, the Hillary Clinton campaign and the DNC paid foreign individuals to interfere in our election.

It amazes me that even some smart reporters have said all this Ukraine stuff has been disproven. No, it hasn't. They act as if Russia and Ukraine activity—that you couldn't have misconduct in Russia and also have misconduct in Ukraine. Absolutely you could. In fact, we know that countries around the world, including China, have been trying to affect our elections.

For those who have been students of Russia and their current highest leader, Putin, Putin didn't care so much who got elected in that election. We

have heard testimony that they provided things to help Hillary Clinton as well. That doesn't come out in the media a whole lot because it is not consistent with what the alt-left media would have you believe.

But they did things to help Hillary Clinton, and they did things to help Donald Trump. They were not as much interested in who got elected as they were about dividing America, and they have been extremely successful with that.

America is divided. It is terribly divided. People get mad at each other in this Chamber and in committees. It is so frustrating. I hope it doesn't get as bad in the Senate as it has here.

But Putin succeeded. And they didn't have to spend hardly any money, not much money, to divide America.

They have tried for so long, yet here, with some unknowing allies, they have been able to divide America like hadn't happened in the last 150 years. It is tragic.

I am hopeful that Senators will understand that the accounts they have seen in the media are rarely factual, that they are going to have to do a little bit of digging, that they are not going to be able to take summaries at face value, and that they need to do some real digging, do some real homework to find out exactly what the facts are. They will be amazed.

I am hoping that people who will be deposed will include Alexandra Chalupa, Eric Ciaramella, Abigail Grace, and Sean Misko. I have said that for months.

Some report stories and say: "Oh, Gohmert named the whistleblower." No, I didn't. I named four fact witnesses. Apparently, all these media folks must know who the whistleblower is to say that I named him.

I have never named a whistleblower. We were told earlier on apparently it was a male, but I haven't named the whistleblower ever. I have named people I think are fact witnesses and that I think would be very good to have in depositions in the Senate. I hope they will be called.

I don't think they need Vindman again. They certainly don't need law professors who are so inconsistent and just have a law professor act like he is really reluctant to talk about impeachment, have people talk about how serious and how reluctant they are, when, actually, like in the case of the Harvard professor, he has been talking about it since right after the election. He has been trying to come up with ways to impeach President Trump. These were not honest witnesses.

Then you have people like Turley, Professors Turley and Dershowitz, who were actually trying to be fair and who have been extremely consistent. I have had profound disagreements with both of those professors on some issues, but I have always found them to be honest.

Some people are shocked that I have liberal friends who are Democrats. When people are honest, you under-

stand where they are coming from. When they haven't lied to you, you can work together. That can happen, and it does happen here.

I hope that this impeachment stuff ends so that we can get back to helping the President help America, as he has been doing for 3 years. He has done an extraordinary job. Until the impeachment is over, apparently, that is not going to happen.

For those who believe in the power of prayer, we need to be asking God for mercy. I would implore people who believe in the power of prayer in the United States: Do not pray for justice because we don't want God's justice to come down on America or we are over.

□ 1215

We need mercy. We need grace. We need direction, and we need to come back to the place where we recognize there is an absolute right or wrong. It comes from a universal source, as C. S. Lewis talked about, where he came from being an atheist to becoming, ultimately, a Christian.

But the realization started that he could never know that there was a fair and unfair, a right and wrong, a just or unjust, unless there was some ubiquitous universal standard of right and wrong. Otherwise, he would be like a man born blind. If you have never seen the light, how can you know that there is light and dark? You have never seen it. You have never experienced it.

So there has to be something placed in our hearts that gives us an idea of right and wrong, truth and untruth. And just because, as he said, some people come closer to hitting it right, doesn't mean there is no absolute right and wrong, just or unjust.

We need to get back to the point where truth matters, justice matters. And when we have officials, as we still do—we still have some in our Justice Department, in our intelligence department or agencies, in the FBI—and we do need a new FBI Director, he is part of the problem—but until we get back to having people in the Justice Department, in intel, who are honest, honorable, just, upright people, then we will continue our slide toward the dustbin of history.

No Nation lasts forever. The United States won't. But my prayer is that we will come together and do the things that will allow this country to succeed as a Republic with people having freedom for at least 50 more years. Is that too much to ask?

I know people are worried about climate change. We won't make another dozen years where we are right now unless we have some massive reform within our government. We need to come together to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C.

1024(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, to rank after Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

DISINFORMATION IS THE BIG MAMA OF ALL WEAPONS TARGETING OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has gone through quite a tumultuous first 15 days of 2020. We marched right up to the brink of war after President Donald Trump authorized the assassination of Iranian General Soleimani. And even though the Iranians did launch a measured attack, it is like the argument that the husband believed he won with his wife. It ain't over yet.

Long before the current crisis with Iran, our peerless intelligence agencies began warning us of robust cyberattacks from Russia, China, North Korea, and, of course, Iran. These nations are all hell-bent on doing damage to us and using bots, an online method of passing disinformation to unsuspecting Americans, with the ultimate goal of turning unsuspecting Americans against each other.

If we do that, we are repeating or allowing the repetition of what the Russians did in 2016, which is to again meddle in our upcoming quadrennial election.

Now, for me, it is difficult to blame our enemies for seeking to exploit the weaknesses in our society, because it is so crystal clear to me that we are doing to ourselves what our enemies have been unable to do in the last 150 years.

Our current extreme political partisanship and reliance on social media—which is, by the way, littered with disinformation—but with that, we have allowed a well to be dug into the soul of American democracy. Our Nation is wounded and it is a wound that our enemies will seek to further infect.

Sadly, I must give some frightening news to our Nation. This, I guess, is a matter of national security information. Russia has designed and advanced the most menacing, yet non-nuclear weapons on Earth. Every American should know that the blast from this bomb can do greater damage to our Nation than the combined marching armies of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my fellow Americans: We are now threatened by the big mama of all weapons. It is called disinformation and the delivery system is called Facebook and other forms of social media.

In many ways, Congress has been complicit in this tribalistic way in

which we conduct business in our Nation. We have opened wide the door to a brazen alien incursion into our elections. Some Members of this august body are actually pushing disinformation into the delivery system.

In days gone by, kings and lords built their fortresses around deep wells to provide cool and clear water for those who lived inside the garrison. Strategically, these wells were inside the walls of forts so that at a time of an attack from the enemy, the water supply could never be blocked so that the life-saving water, in a time of war, would be controlled by those inside the fort. Therefore, the inhabitants would not be at the mercy of invaders.

Here is the point: If our great Republic could be led by our leaders into the babbling, cool waters of internal oneness and toleration, we will not be victims of the kind of vicious misinformation that has been flowing across this Nation now for a number of years. We would not be vulnerable to the whims of those who wish to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, I close with an ominous note: Most of the great empires throughout the history of the world fell into decline not because of some new military juggernaut, but because of internal fighting and the failure to appreciate the amazing ethnic and racial mosaic that is uniquely ours as Americans.

Will that happen to us? Let me just say that we can only be saved by the well water of civility and decency inside our Nation. We control what is inside our Nation. What we need most is inside our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we please accept and remember and meditate on this: Under the right conditions, even the most inspirational democracy in the history of the world can wane.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM "BILL" GRAVES WOFFORD, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor William "Bill" Graves Wofford, Jr., of Rockwall, Texas, who passed away on October 29, 2019, at the age of 95.

Bill was born on May 1, 1924, in Fort Worth, Texas to William Graves Wofford, Sr., and Margaret Melinda Wofford.

As a very young man, Bill left his family to fight in World War II and to defend our country. He proudly served in both the U.S. Army and the U.S. Navy. At the close of the war, at the age of 21, Bill returned to the States to pursue an education from the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Following graduation, Bill returned home to Texas where he embarked on

his 27-year career alongside business partner, Bob Timberlake, to form Timberlake & Wofford, a manufacturing representative firm that served the north Texas area and experienced great success.

Bill is remembered for his great sense of humor and his gentle personality. His love of sailing and the outdoors led him to help found the Rush Creek Yacht Club.

Bill was not only a leader in his community, but a friend to all: a loving husband, father, and grandfather.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Wofford family. We also lift up the family and friends of Bill Wofford in our prayers.

I have requested that the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor his life, legacy, and his service to our country.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for the brave men and women who serve in our military who protect us, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DEPUTY SHERIFF MATTHEW RYAN JONES

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Matthew Ryan Jones of Waco, Texas.

Deputy Sheriff Jones was killed on October 11, 2019 in the line of duty as he assisted a motorist on the side of an area highway.

Matt was born on February 7, 1989, in Waco, Texas, to Ronnie and Debbie Coleman Jones. He graduated from Connally High School and the Texas State Technical College in Waco before joining the Falls County Sheriff's Office in August of 2015.

Matt bravely served his community for 4 years, most recently being named the department's canine deputy. Fellow first responders have sung the praises of their fallen brother stating that: Matt "never backed down from a challenge and understood the nature of policing in a small community."

Matt was not only a proud public servant, he was a friend to all, a loving husband, and an avid outdoorsman. Matt enjoyed spending time in nature, hunting, fishing, and riding his ATV.

Mr. Speaker, Matt's life was defined by his service to his community. He will be forever remembered by his community as a husband, a son, a brother, and a selfless public servant.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Jones family. We also lift up the family and friends of Matthew in our prayers.

I have requested the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor his life, legacy, and his service to our central Texas community.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who protect us overseas, and for our first responders who keep us safe here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for January 15 and today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 263. An act to rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

H.R. 434. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purpose.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 457.—An act to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 17, 2020, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3588. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's Policy Statement — Policy Statement on Compliance Aids received January 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3589. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OCC-2019-0025] (RIN: 1557-AE72) received January 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3590. A letter from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act Regulations; Exemptions for the Investigations Case Management System [BSEE-2016-0001; 201E1700D2 EECC000000 ETIEX0000.G40000] (RIN: 1014-AA41) received January 13, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3591. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of a final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-04; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2019-0001; Sequence No.: 9] received January 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3592. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Small Entity Compliance Guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-04 [Docket No.: FAR-2019-0001, Sequence No. 9] received January 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3593. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Trade Agreements Thresholds [FAC: 2020-04; FAR Case 2019-012; Docket No.: FAR-2019-0012; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN95) received January 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3594. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments received January 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3595. A letter from the Director, General Counsel and Legal Policy Division, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — 2020 Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustments for Ethics in Government Act Violations (RIN: 3209-AA49) received January 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3596. A letter from the Secretary, Office of the General Counsel, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's notice — Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts [Release Nos.: 33-10740; 34-87905; IA-5428; IC-33740] received January 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3597. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2020 Standard Mileage Rates (Notice 2020-05) received January 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3598. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Regulations Relating to Withholding and Reporting Tax on Certain U.S. Source Income Paid to Foreign Persons [TD 9890] (RIN: 1545-BN73, 1545-BN74, 1545-B023, 1545-BN79, 1545-B030) received January 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3599. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update to Revenue Procedure 2019-4 (RP-120434-19) received January 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3600. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major rule — Investing in Qualified Opportunity Funds [TD 9889] (RIN: 1545-BP04) received January 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 79. Resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; with an amendment (Rept. 116-378). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESCOBAR (for herself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5625. A bill to authorize the imposition of sanctions with respect to significant actions that exacerbate climate change, to reinforce comprehensive efforts to limit global average temperature rise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 5626. A bill to abolish the Conscience and Religious Freedom Division in the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 5627. A bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 with respect to pre-agreement costs of emergency watershed protection measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 5628. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to modify certain allotments under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina):

H.R. 5629. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide classes on financial literacy to elementary and secondary students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 5630. A bill to provide that the Social Security Administration pay fees associated with obtaining birth certificate or State identification card for purposes of obtaining a replacement social security card for certain victims of domestic violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIM (for himself and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 5631. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide grants to medical and other health profession schools to expand or develop education and training programs for substance use prevention and treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 5632. A bill to establish procedures regarding the approval of opioid drugs by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIM (for himself and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 5633. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to provide for a public education campaign for the promotion outreach and education campaign to raise public awareness of synthetic opioids; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 5634. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require that past-due benefits be paid prior to the payment of social security representative fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 5635. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain from disposition of virtual currency in a personal transaction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5636. A bill to provide for the accurate reporting of fossil fuel extraction and emissions by entities with leases on public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. BACON, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COLE, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 5637. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish presumptions of service connection for diseases associated with firefighting; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 5638. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act to prevent a species that is not native to the United States from being listed as an endangered species or a threatened species, to prohibit certain types of financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 5639. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish urns for the remains of certain veterans whose cremated remains are not interred in certain cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 5640. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5641. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide grants and develop value capture policy; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 5642. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to set aside not less than 5 percent of certain funds for certain active transportation projects and activities from the Federal lands transportation program and Federal lands access program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 5643. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 5644. A bill to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 5645. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal appellate court proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. FULCHER):

H.R. 5646. A bill to provide for the creation of the Missing Armed Forces Personnel Records Collection at the National Archives, to require the expeditious public transmission to the Archivist and public disclosure of Missing Armed Forces Personnel records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BOST, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. MALINOWSKI):

H.R. 5647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 5648. A bill to direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to furnish stellate ganglion block to veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 5649. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to establish a grant program to fund research and development with respect to certain cellular phone applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 5650. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to improve Federal energy and water performance requirements for Federal buildings and establish a Federal Energy Management Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 5651. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to require assurances that certain family planning service projects and programs will provide pamphlets containing the contact information of adoption centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H. Res. 801. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 802. A resolution affirming the United States vital interest in liberty in Europe and resolute support for Ukraine in its efforts to counter Russian aggression and continue its trajectory among the community of democracies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. BERA, Mr. BOST, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. STANTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. VELA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CASE, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. ROUDA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TRONE, Mr. KIND, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HECK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H. Res. 803. A resolution recognizing the longstanding partnership between the United States and Australia to share critical firefighting resources during times of crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 5625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by

this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 5626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 5628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 5629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 5630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 5631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 5632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 5633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 5634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV,

Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 5635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 5636.

121 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 5637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 5638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 5639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 5640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises; to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States"

and, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States"

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1 vests the judicial power of the United States in the Supreme Court and any inferior courts Congress establishes. Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any "other" powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 5646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 5648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 5649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 5651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 219: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 445: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 490: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 587: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 803: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 929: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. BALDERSON, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 943: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1133: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1135: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1255: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1256: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1346: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1355: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1400: Mr. ALLRED, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1549: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1688: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1707: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1735: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1748: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1816: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1878: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1978: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1995: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2013: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2117: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2128: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2148: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. MCBATH, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2195: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2214: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 2223: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2260: Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 2315: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2434: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2466: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2482: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2651: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2655: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2662: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2679: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2711: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2747: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2771: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2812: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2818: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

- H.R. 2843: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 2912: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 2931: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 2952: Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 2953: Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 2991: Mr. LAMB and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 3077: Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 3107: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 3225: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 3241: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 3368: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3436: Mr. TIMMONS.
 H.R. 3570: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 3654: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 3742: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 3825: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 3842: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 3969: Ms. STEVENS.
 H.R. 3975: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 4069: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 4189: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 4228: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 4296: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 4564: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 4681: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. BRINDISI.
 H.R. 4685: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 4764: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 4792: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 4807: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 4903: Mr. FLORES, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 4926: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 4928: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 4946: Mr. HILL of Arkansas.
 H.R. 5104: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 5151: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 5169: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 5191: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 5200: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 5319: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
 H.R. 5394: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 5427: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 5450: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 5451: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 5492: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 5507: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 5517: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 5528: Mr. CRIST, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 5548: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
 H.R. 5552: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 5589: Ms. STEVENS.
 H. J. Res. 66: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. MORELLE.
 H. Res. 114: Mr. TRONE and Mr. COMER.
 H. Res. 374: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
 H. Res. 687: Mrs. AXNE.
 H. Res. 729: Mr. POCAN.
 H. Res. 742: Mrs. AXNE.
 H. Res. 789: Mr. YOHO.
 H. Res. 791: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CLINE, Mr. ESTES, Mr. WALTZ, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H. Res. 797: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. DEAN, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.